

TOCHARIAN AND INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES
SUPPLEMENTARY SERIES

VOLUME 3



JÖRUNDUR HILMARSSON

The Nasal Prefixes in Tocharian

A Study in Word Formation

Toch 76

REYKJAVÍK 1991

TOCHARIAN AND INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES
SUPPLEMENTARY SERIES

VOLUME 3

EDITOR: JÖRUNDUR HILMARSSON

Editorial Advisory Board:

Douglas Q. ADAMS (Idaho)
Enrico CAMPANILE (Pisa)
Lambert ISEBAERT (Namur)
Xian-lin JI (Peking)
Fredrik O. LINDEMAN (Oslo)
Georges PINAULT (Paris)
Klaus T. SCHMIDT (Saarbrücken)
Werner WINTER (Kiel)

Hreinn BENEDIKTSSON (Reykjavík)
Ronald E. EMMERICK (Hamburg)
Jay JASANOFF (Cornell)
Frederik KORTLANDT (Leiden)
H. Craig MELCHERT (N-Carolina)
Jochem SCHINDLER (Vienna)
Werner THOMAS (Frankfurt)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	7
§1. Introduction.....	9
§2. The development of initial R - and HR -.....	11
§3. The Tocharian shapes of the nasal prefixes: a preview.....	12
§4. Problems concerning the privatives.....	14
§5. Accentuation patterns in subjunctive class V.....	17
§6. The privatives: An introduction	19
§7. Privatives in Common Tocharian $-āttæ$: Group Ia.....	19
§8. Privatives in Common Tocharian $-āttæ$: Group Ib.....	48
§9. Privatives in Common Tocharian $-āttæ$: Group Ic.....	62
§10. Accentuation patterns in subjunctive classes I and II.....	79
§11. Privatives in Common Tocharian $-āttæ$: Group IIa.....	83
§12. Privatives in Common Tocharian $-āttæ$: Group IIb.....	94
§13. Privatives in Common Tocharian $-āttæ$: Group IIc.....	109
§14. A privative of uncertain formation.....	117
§15. Denominative formations: Introduction.....	118
§16. Formations in prefixal $*ā(N)$ -.....	118
§17. Formations in prefixal $*o(N)$ -.....	130
§18. Formations in prefixal B $e(N)$ -, A $a(N)$ -.....	161
§19. Formations in prefixal $*yā(N)$ -.....	181
§20. Summary of main conclusions.....	192
Indices.....	200
References.....	211

TOCHARIAN AND INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES
SUPPLEMENTARY SERIES

Volume 3

JÖRUNDUR HILMARSSON:

THE NASAL PREFIXES IN TOCHARIAN
A STUDY IN WORD FORMATION

Published in co-operation with Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands

Copyright 1991 by TOCHARIAN AND INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES
Printed by SKÁKPRENT, REYKJAVÍK

ISSN 1015 – 4434

Preface

The present study aims at an evaluation of each and every Tocharian word that exhibits a nasal prefix of one kind or another so as to enable a clearer view to some patterns of Tocharian word formation. The words collected here are those found in the usual handbooks and lexica such as Krause's *Westtocharische Grammatik I*, Thomas & Krause's *Tocharisches Elementarbuch II*, Van Windekens' *Le tokharien ...*, Poucha's *Thesaurus*, etc. Besides, I have made use of Winter's glossary of the Berlin texts (manuscript), Broomhead's edition and vocabulary of the London texts (manuscript), and several shorter word-lists as found in K. T. Schmidt's *Karmavācana* edition (manuscript), Pinault's *Épigraphie*, Bernhard's *Nominalkomposition* (manuscript), etc. Some forms may be missing, especially from the Paris texts, many of which have not been published yet.

At the Tocharian "Tagung" of the *Indogermanische Gesellschaft* in Berlin (September 1990) I read a paper revealing some preliminary conclusions of my study presented here. That summary will be published with the other conference papers in *TIES* Supplementary volume 4 [forthcoming 1992]. The conclusions presented there do not differ much from those presented here. Indeed, a few new forms from recently edited Paris texts, unavailable to me earlier, have confirmed my preliminary conclusions (e.g. *B emprukşai*, cf. §18.1.14).

Introduction

§1. Prefixes containing a nasal are in Tocharian of various shapes, but these shapes are mostly conditioned by specific (often late) Tocharian umlauting or — as will be seen — accentual phenomena. Historically, the nasal prefixes represent either the Indo-European negative prefix **ǵ-* ‘un-, not-’ (cf. Skt. *a-* / *an-*, Gk. *ἀ-* / *ἀν-*, Lat. *in-*, Gmc. **un-*, etc.), or they represent what I shall term here the local prefix that in Indo-European had the forms (full grade) **H₁en-* and (zero grade) **H₁ǵ-*,¹ expressing close local contact, primarily ‘in’. The full grade **H₁en-* yielded Common Toch. **yän-* quite regularly, whereas the zero grade **H₁ǵ-* of the local prefix and the negative **ǵ-* merged in Common Toch. **æn-*.²

§1.1. Actually, it seems likely that the full grade **H₁en* was originally a free form used as a preposition, cf. Hamp 1973: 84-85. That assumption is not necessarily corroborated by Tocharian though, although here the prefix **yän-* < **H₁en-* is found almost exclusively with adverbs, which could be interpreted in such a way that former prepositional locutions of **H₁en* + noun have been lexicalized as adverbial compounds, cf. e.g. B *kaum* ‘day, sun’ ~ *yñkaum* ‘by day’, *eš**

¹ In spite of Van Windekens (e.g. 1976: 154-156) there seems no evidence for **H₁on-*.

² Cf. Hilmarsson 1984: 116 sq. = 1986: 107 sq. for the development of the Indo-European syllabic resonants in initial position in Tocharian.

(du.) 'eyes' ~ *ynes* adv. 'evidently, (lit.) in the eyes', indecl. adj. 'evident', etc. From a synchronic Tocharian point of view exceptions do occur, though, for occasionally we also find declinable nouns with the prefix **yän-*, e.g. B *yapoy* (A *ype*) 'country' (B gen. sg. *ypoyntse*), reflecting I.-E. **H₁en* + *bhuH₂-i* (originally locative), cf. Hilmarsson 1988: 31 sq. for this analysis; see also §19.2 below). However, beside the full grade **H₁en-*, the zero grade **H₁Ø-* of the local prefix is also found in abundance in Tocharian. And as the reflex of **H₁en*, it is found in adverbial formations almost exclusively, clearly representing earlier prepositional phrases, cf. e.g. B *eraitwe* 'in connection with' ~ *raitwe* 'means, connection', *enäkätke* 'in depth, deeply' ~ *kätke* 'deep', etc. There thus seems to be no functional difference in the use of Tocharian **yän-* and **æñ-*: their meanings seem identical, and both are found (almost exclusively) in adverbial forms that can be interpreted as earlier prepositional phrases. Furthermore, both are followed by a noun in the oblique case, which suggests that the oblique case had become the general prepositional case by the time of the univerbation of preposition and noun (so Penney 1989: 56). It is possible that an exceptional form like B *yapoy* (A *ype*) 'land' (cf. above) is a relic, constituting the lexicalization of an original prepositional phrase with **H₁en* + noun in the locative case, cf. also A *ynālek* 'elsewhere' (§19.7), *ylanikam* 'pending' (§19.4).

§1.2. In the following investigation I shall endeavour to discuss fully all problems incurred by the Tocharian forms that exhibit these prefixes. This will include (but not necessarily always in that order) a formal analysis of the shapes of the prefix, i.e., on the one hand, an explanation of its vocalisms, and, on the other hand, a definition of the conditions for the loss or retention of the prefixal nasals, a formal analysis (phonological and morphological) of the second member of the

prefixed compounds, a discussion of the diverse questions of word formation raised by the compounds, a semantic analysis, and, where necessary, a philological interpretation of the attested forms.

§1.3. As implied by the title, the present work is primarily concerned with two problems of Tocharian phonology and morphology. One is the question of the phonological development of the diverse forms of the three nasal prefixes, viz. the negative prefix, presumably reflecting I.-E. **ǵ-*, in the shapes of B *e(N)-*, **ā(N)-*, *o(N)-*, A *a(N)-*, *ā(N)-*, *o(N)-*, and the two local prefixes in the shapes of B **y(ä)(N)-*, A *y(N)-* on the one hand, reflecting I.-E. **H₁en-*, and B *e(N)-*, **ā(N)-*, *o(N)-*, A *a(N)-*, *ā(N)-*, *o(N)-* on the other, representing I.-E. **H₂ǵ-* (*N* stands for any nasal). The local prefixes, whose basic sense is 'in, at, on', are exclusively used in denominative derivation (with the possible exception of B *ānāsk-* 'to inhale', §16.1.4), whereas the negative prefix is used in denominative as well as deverbative derivation. The deverbative derivatives created through such a prefixation are the so-called privatives, conveying the meaning that the action of the verb either has not, cannot, or should not be carried out. The second problem treated here is the question of the formation of these privatives. As will be seen, the answers to both problems are intricately locked together.

The development of initial *R-* and *HR-*

§2. It can be considered fairly well established now that the normal and unconditioned Tocharian reflex of an Indo-European vocalic resonant, preceded or not by laryngeal, in absolute initial position was B *eR-*, A *aR-* (Common Toch. **ǣR-*). The Indo-European prefixes **ǵ-* 'un-, not-' and **H₂ǵ-* 'in-' (local), therefore, yielded B *e(N)-*, A *a(N)-*,

regularly (Common Toch. *æN-). This development of the vocalic resonant, proper to initial ante-consonantal position, took place in initial ante-vocalic position also, cf. the similar development in other Indo-European languages, e.g. (negative prefix) Skt. *a-*, Gk. *α-* before consonants, Skt. *an-*, Gk. *αν-* before vowels (normally; Gk. *ν-* before vowels is rare).

The Tocharian shapes of the nasal prefixes: a preview

§3. The original Tocharian forms of the nasal prefixes were thus **yän-* (< I.-E. **H₁en-*) and **æn-* (< I.-E. **H₁ǵ-* and **ǵ-*). The first, Toch. **yän-*, is problematic only in as far as the nasal goes. Apart from loanwords, this prefix is attested only in a few words in East Tocharian, while in West Tocharian it is slightly more common. Its initial **y-* is always retained in both Tocharian languages, and its vocalism is always lost through syncope in East Tocharian, whereas in West Tocharian it is syncopeated when unaccented (even in a closed syllable) but retained when accented (**ǣ* > B *a*). The nasal is in both languages preserved before vowels. In East Tocharian it is lost before consonants unconditionally, while in West Tocharian it is lost before consonants with the exception of *k* and *p* before which it is sometimes lost and sometimes retained. E.g. (loanwords in brackets):

B *ynāñm* [A *ynāñm*] 'worthy', cf. B *āñme*, obl. sg. *āñm*

B *ynes* [A *ynes*] 'evidently', cf. B *eśane* dual to *ek* 'eye'

B *ysāmna* 'among people', cf. B *sāmna* plural to *śaumo* 'human'

B *yñkaum*, A *ykoṃ* 'in the day-time', cf. B *kaum*, A *koṃ* 'day'

B *yparwe* 'at first', cf. B *parwe* 'at first'

B *yapoy*, A *ype* 'land'

The second, Toch. **æn-*, whose nasal is problematic in the same manner as the nasal of **yän-*, is far more common. Its reflexes are primarily found in West Tocharian, but it is not unusual in East Tocharian either. The initial vowel is normally reflected as B *e-*, A *a-*, but due to *ā*-umlaut, *u*-umlaut, *o*-umlaut, or rounding through the effect of following labial consonants, it can turn up as B **ā-*, *o-*, A *ā-*, *o-*. Before root initial *y-* and *w-* the prefixal vowel yields the first element of the diphthongs *ai-*, *au-*, monophthongized in East Tocharian as *e-*, *o-*. The nasal of **æn-* behaves in the same manner as that of **yän-*, with the notable exception that after a rounded prefixal vocalism, it is almost always preserved in West Tocharian, irrespective of the following consonant.³ E.g.

B *emparkre*, A *apärkär* 'in detail', cf. B *pärkare* 'long'

B *ekalymi*, A *akälyme* 'in the power of', cf. B *kälymiye*,
A *kälyme* 'direction'

B *aknātsa*, A *āknats* 'unknowing', cf. A *knā-* 'to know'

B *anaiwatstse**, A *ānewats* 'unloved', cf. B *aiw-* 'to turn toward'

B *omprotärtstse** 'in a brotherly relation', cf. B *protär* (obl. sg.)
'brother'

A *oklop* 'in danger', cf. A *klop* 'pain, misfortune'

B *epinke*, A *opäntäš* 'in between', cf. B *pinke*, A *pänt* 'fifth'

³ For apparent exceptions, see below: B (§17.1.3) *omotruññaišše*, (§17.1.11) *oppilom*, (§17.1.12) *orkäntai*, (§17.1.13) *ośonai*, (§17.1.14) *oṣšale*, (§17.2.3) *onuwaññie*.

B *airpätte* 'unheeding', cf. B *yärp-* 'to heed'

A *oṣeñi* 'at night', cf. A *wṣe* 'night'

Problems concerning the privatives

§4. Since the first identification of the privatives by Meillet (Lévi & Meillet 1913: 20), who actually saw in them participles in **-to-*, their formation has remained disputed. Several problems – of phonological, morphological and word formational nature – have been encountered.

§4.1. First, while it has been unanimously agreed that the first syllable reflects a negation, and while the *communis opinio* has assumed that this negation should be posited as **ṛ-* (Couvreur 1947: 26, Winter 1952: 188, Bernhard 1958: 36), Van Windekens (e.g. 1976: 155) has suggested that in some instances the preform was **on-*. In view of the lack of evidence from other languages for a negating I.-E. **on-*, Van Windekens' suggestion appears very improbable – the more so as such a preform is quite unnecessary in order to explain the various forms of the prefix in Tocharian as was principally demonstrated by Couvreur 1947: 26 and Winter 1952: 188. This will be further illustrated below and the diverse vocalisms in the surface structure of the prefix will be discussed in detail. Similar arguments apply to Van Windekens' parallel explanation of the local (or as he calls it, the "intensive") prefix. Here also, we can get by with an Indo-European preform **H₁ṛ-* (beside **H₂en-*). In the last volume of his Tocharian comparative grammar, Van Windekens (1982: 250sq.) has relinquished his earlier views on this

matter and rallied to the side of Couvreur and the communally held opinion.

§4.2. Second, the nasal of the negating prefix as well as of the local prefix has presented a problem, for sometimes it is retained and sometimes it is lost. No rule has been found that would explain this phenomenon, cf. e.g. Krause 1952: 42 who declares: "Dem Vokal des Präfixes kann – ohne erkennbaren Grund – ein Nasal folgen ..." Van Windekens has repeatedly proposed (e.g. 1976: 155) that the nasal was originally retained in ante-vocalic position and lost in ante-consonantal position. From ante-vocalic position the nasal could then be analogically extended to ante-consonantal position. It is true that the nasal is always and regularly retained in ante-vocalic position and analogy could perhaps not be principally ruled out. However, the fact that the West Tocharian instances of a nasal in ante-consonantal position are attested only before *p* and *k* but never before *t* or resonants or sibilants (as already noted by Sieg & Siegling & Schulze 1931: 247), unless the prefixal vocalism is rounded in which case the nasal is (almost) always retained, would seem to indicate that no haphazard analogy was at play here. Rather, the distribution points to some kind of a rule. The conditioning factor, as I shall endeavour to demonstrate in this study, was accent.

§4.3. Third, the final *-tte* of the privatives has been traced back to an I.-E. **-tuo-* (Krause 1952: 203, Krause and Thomas 1960: 188) or **-to-* (Meillet in Lévi & Meillet 1920: 20, Van Windekens 1944: 130, Couvreur 1947: 26, *et al.*). It appears, however, that an I.-E. **-tuo-* could not account for the East Tocharian form of the privative suffix, which, as pointed out by Winter 1972: 387-388, Van Windekens 1979: 95, ought to have been ***tu* and not the attested *-t*, cf. A *spartu* 'lock, curled hair' as against B *spertte*, both forms reflecting Common

Toch. **spærtwæ* to the verbal root of A *spārtw-*, B *spārtt-* 'to turn, conduct oneself'. The privatives are deverbative formations conveying the sense that something is not to be, cannot or should not take place, or has not taken place. With provision made for the negative prefix and, ergo, the negative meaning of these Tocharian adjectives, this sense, as carried by the suffix **-to-*, is found in deverbative adjectives in other languages, e.g. Gk. *φυκτός* 'who is to be shunned', *ἄσχετος* 'who is not to be restrained', Skt. *yajatá-* 'who is to be adored', *darśatá-* 'visible' and in the ubiquitous past participles in **-to-*. Functionally, B *-tte* and A *-t* can thus be equated with I.-E. **-to-*, but formally one would have expected a single dental and not a geminate. The doubling of the dental is probably either to be seen as analogous to the suffixal geminates of other Tocharian suffixes: B *-šše*, *-ññe*, *-lle*, *-tstse*, Hilmarsson 1986: 323 = 1987[89]: 83-84, or one might perhaps with Pedersen 1941: 218 view the gemination as due to a purely phonological development in polysyllabic forms.

§4.4. Fourth, the question of the formation of the privatives has not been satisfactorily answered. Couvreur 1947: 26 assumed that they are formed to the "futurum-conjunctief (= praeteritum)" stem; Krause 1952: 41 stated more generally that they are derived from the verbal root; Krause and Thomas 1960: 192-193 classify the privatives with the derivatives from the subjunctive stem and this view is approved of by Van Windekens 1982: 250.

Marggraf 1970: 43sq. has a short discussion of the formation of the privatives. Pointing out that while in several instances the privative may appear to have something to do with the subjunctive (e.g. *akākatte* ~ subj. *kākatār*, *akāutatte* ~ abstr. *kāutalñe*), in other instances the main connection appears to be with the preterite (e.g. *áikatte* ~ pret. *yáika*, but

subj. *wikāṣṣām*, *eñkālpatte* ~ pret. *kālpā-*, but subj. *källā-* < **kālpnā-*). Furthermore, Marggraf points out that the formation of many privatives has clear parallels in the formation of the preterite participles (e.g. *akākatte* ~ past ptc. *kakākau*, *anākätte* ~ past ptc. *nanāku*, *eñkālpatte* ~ past ptc. *kālpau*, etc.). However, a form like *əspirtatte* does not agree with the past ptc. *pešpirttu*, where one might have expected ***əspirtätte*.

Marggraf (*o.c.*, p. 45) points out that it is extremely difficult to unite the privatives and the past participles under a common denominator and then join them together to a common stem of the verb. He thereupon concludes that there is no necessity to classify the privatives as the derivatives of some specific tempus-stem. Instead, he opts for a solution suggested to him privately by Winter, according to which the privatives and the past participles are to be derived from a verbal stem which is often, but not necessarily, identical with the subjunctive stem.

The question of the formation of the privatives and the identification of the basic verbal stem from which they are derived is interesting not only in itself; it is crucially important for the determination of the conditions for the retention or the loss of the prefixal nasal. The following discussion will make it clear that the privatives are always and exclusively formed to the subjunctive stem of their respective verbs.

Accentuation patterns in subjunctive class V

§5. All Tocharian privative forms, along with the relevant – or potentially relevant – stem forms of their respective verbs will be listed

presently. A detailed formal analysis of each and every privative will be given simultaneously.

§5.1. Before listing these forms, however, it is necessary to draw attention to two of the general conclusions of Marggraf's exceedingly important study of the West Tocharian accentuation (Marggraf 1970), for they are of the utmost relevance for the solution of the problem of the formation of the privatives as well as for the problem of the retention or loss of the prefixal nasal. First, Marggraf (*o.c.*, p. 41) showed that in Tocharian derivation – verbal as well as nominal – the accent of the primary stem is continued in the derivative. Second, the presence or absence of accent on some of the temporal or modal stem suffixes that are sometimes accentuated and sometimes not (Marggraf, *o.c.*, p. 23, 26, 30-31) is conditioned as follows:

active forms have initial accent

medial forms in transitive use have initial accent

medial forms in intransitive use have suffixal accent.

The second rule applies, e.g., in the subjunctives of class V, but not, e.g., in the preterites of class I (Marggraf, p. 37): radical as well as suffixal accentuation is found in subjunctive class V, but preterite class I knows only suffixal accentuation. It will be demonstrated that the loss or retention of the nasal of the privatives correlates with Marggraf's accent rule for subjunctive V and, therefore, not only serves to confirm it, but also serves to exclude the possibility that the privatives can be derived from preterite stems (which, in many cases, would have been phonologically impossible anyway, cf., e.g., *ekatkatte** 'not crossing' to the verb *kätk-* 'to cross' with the preterite I *sätkä* – but subjunctive V

kátkā-). It seems a natural step to conclude that the (original) accentuation of the privatives, taken over from the underlying *formes de fondation*, is responsible for the loss or survival of the nasal, because initial accent of the basic verbal (subjunctive) stem form correlates with loss of the nasal of the privative, whereas suffixal accent of the basic verbal (subjunctive) stem form correlates with retention of the nasal of the privative.⁴

The privatives: An introduction

§6. On the following lists the privatives are confronted with the various stem forms of their respective verbs and their formation discussed. First comes the privative itself, then the verb's present stem, subjunctive stem, and preterite stem, and finally the past participle. The privatives are divided into two main groups: those that are formed to a verbal stem in *-ā-*, and those that are formed to a verbal stem in *-ä-*. The first group is divided into three subgroups (Ia–Ic) depending on the stem formational patterns of the underlying verbs. In a similar manner, the second group is divided into three subgroups (IIa–IIc).

Privatives in Common Tocharian *-āttæ* Group Ia

§7. Group Ia contains privatives in B **-ätte* to verbs forming subjunctives of class V, preterites of class Ibβ, and reduplicated past

⁴ In an extremely interesting study that will appear shortly in *TIES*, Þórhallur Eyþórsson offers a quite different – and in many respects convincing – interpretation of subjunctive class V accentuation patterns. Should his interpretation prove correct, it would still – *mutatis mutandis* – not affect gravely the results concerning the privatives as presented in my present work.

participles. Their present stems vary. Accent of the verbal stems is indicated, if it can be inferred from the attested forms with certainty; MQ-texts do not reveal the place of the accent.

Group Ia

privative	pres.	subj.	pret.	past ptc.
<i>akākatte</i>	suppletive	<i>kākā-</i>	<i>kākā-</i>	<i>kakākau</i>
<i>akautatte*</i>	<i>kautānā-</i> VI	<i>kautā-</i>	<i>kautā-</i>	<i>kakautau</i>
<i>akraupatte</i>	<i>kraupä-</i> II <i>kraupnā-</i> VI	<i>krāupā-</i>	<i>kraupā-</i>	<i>kakraupau</i>
<i>alaitatte*</i>	<i>laito-</i> IV	<i>lāitā-</i>	<i>laitā-</i>	<i>lalaitau</i>
<i>amāllatte</i>	<i>mällāṣṣä-</i> X	<i>mällā-</i> MQ	unattested	unattested
<i>amāntatte</i>	<i>māntāññā-</i> XII <i>māntānā-</i> VI	<i>māntā-</i>	<i>māntā-</i>	<i>mamāntau</i>
<i>amaukatte*</i>	unattested	<i>maukā-</i>	<i>maukā-</i>	unattested
<i>anautatte*</i>	unattested	<i>nautā-</i>	<i>nautā-</i>	<i>nanautau</i>
<i>añklautkatte*</i>	<i>klautko-</i> IV	<i>klautkā-</i> MQ	<i>klautkā-</i>	<i>kaklautkau</i>
<i>aspāwatte*</i>	<i>spowo-</i> IV	unattested	unattested	unattested
<i>atākatte</i>	suppletive	<i>tākā-</i>	<i>tākā-</i>	<i>tatākau</i>
<i>awāskatte</i>	<i>wāskāññā-</i> XII	unattested	<i>wāskā-</i>	<i>wawāskau</i>
<i>awlāwatte*</i>	unattested	<i>wlāwā-</i>	<i>wlāwā-</i>	<i>wawlāwau</i>
<i>ayātatte*</i>	<i>yoto-</i> IV	<i>yātā-</i>	<i>yātā-</i>	<i>yayātau</i> ⁵

§7.1. A few preliminary conclusions can be drawn from this material. First of all, it is clear that the privatives are not formed to the

⁵ This privative is perhaps rather to be seen as belonging to Group Ib, cf. §8.4.4.

present stem. Theoretically, they could be formed to the subjunctive or to the preterite – or even to the stem of the past participle minus the reduplication syllable. Alternatively, the privatives could be of common origin with one or the other of these stems without being directly derived from any of them. A cursory glimpse of the forms on the list does not give any indication that Marggraf's accent rule may have relevance for this material. Indeed, there is an apparent contradiction in the loss of the prefixal nasal of *akākatte*, *akautatte**, and *akraupatte*, versus its survival in *añklautkatte**. In view of the initial accentuation of the subjunctive forms (assuming, for the sake of argument, that the subj. V stem *klautkā-* had initial accent) and the suffixal accentuation of the preterite forms of the verbs to which these four privatives are formed, it would seem incongruous to call upon accentual patterns to explain this discrepancy. However, all may not be that simple. As indicated above, Marggraf (*o.c.*, p. 37) points out that class I preterites have constant suffixal accentuation and that no differentiation occurs in that class conditioned by the transitivity or the intransitivity of medial forms. In the class V subjunctives, however, such a differentiation does occur, as referred above, that is, while active forms accentuate the root syllable, medial forms accentuate the root syllable when transitive, but the suffixal syllable when intransitive. Since the preterites to the privatives listed above are all of class I (i.e., Ibβ) and no accent variation can occur in that class, it is worth inspecting, whether the dichotomy of *akākatte*, etc., versus *añklautkatte** can be fitted in with the latent accent alternation quality of the class V subjunctives.

§7.1.1. First, although *akākatte* 'uninvited, uncalled upon' is a *hapax legomenon*, its meaning is assured (331 S b1 *tusa olyapotse*

akākatte yaka ce prekšām '[If he] uncalled upon / uninvited asks him still more than this...'). It is formed to the verb *kāk-*, or rather the verbal stem *kākā-** (with the suppletive stem *kwā-*), 'to call, invite', which, although it forms a medial subjunctive V (3sg. *kākatār*), is transitive in meaning.⁶

§7.1.2. Second, *akautatte** 'unbreakable, unbroken' is attested twice⁷. It is formed to the verb *kaut-* 'to break', which forms an active and transitive subjunctive V (3sg. *káutam*), beside which there is one instance of a medial form (61 Š b3 *káutatr*), whose context is quite inscrutable, but whose accentuation on the initial syllable would indicate transitive meaning.⁸

§7.1.3. Third, *akraupatte* 'uncollected, distracted' is a *hapax legomenon*, formed to the verb *kraup-* 'to collect'. It is attested in the bilingual 537 D a5 *akraupatte pälskoci*, translating the immediately following Skt. *[v]i(bh)[r]āntaci(ttā)* 'uncollected (i.e. distracted) thought'. The verb B *kraup-* forms a medial subjunctive V (attested is only the accentually inconclusive MQR-form 3pl. (*krau*)*pantrā*) with transitive meaning, whose accentuation can be deduced from such subjunctive

⁶ The prefix vocalism has been umlauted by the radical *-ā-*, whose genesis is uncertain due the etymological opacity of this verb.

⁷ H 149. add. 114 a3 *kālśamñeṣṣe no nk=akautacce śānmyate* /// 'But still he fettered the patient [and] unbreakable ///', Pe 1 a1 *spāntaitsñentaṣṣe eñku wājrā akautacce* 'Having seized the unbreakable bolt of faith'.

⁸ The prefix vocalism has suffered *ā*-umlaut caused by the root vocalism. The latter, in turn, reflects an original *-a-*, i.e. the root (or stem) was I.-E. **kaud-* (earlier **keHud-*, or simply a non-laryngeal **kaud-*?), cf. Lat. *cūdō* 'I beat' (for **caudō* after the frequent compounds, so Pokorny 1959: 535), *caudex*, *cōdex* 'block of wood, hewn wood'. The membership of B *kaut-* in present class IV is in accord with the *ā*-vocalism of the verbs of that class. In East Tocharian, *kot-* has been transferred to present class V (e.g., 3sg. act. *kotnaṣ*), which is a secondary phenomenon as shown by the vocalism (i.e. *kot-*, not **kut-*).

derivatives as the infinitive *kráupatsi*, Ger. II *kráupalle*, etc.⁹

§7.1.4. Conversely, *añklautkatte** 'unturning, irreversible'¹⁰ is formed to the intransitive verb *klautk-* 'to turn, become' that forms the subjunctive V *klautkā-*. Although the accentuation of this intransitive subjunctive V stem cannot be inferred from the attested forms, it would harmonize with Marggraf's rule, if it was on the suffix, i.e. *klautkā-*. If such was the case, the retention of the nasal in *añklautkatte** could be seen as a regular result of that. Correspondingly, the loss of the nasal of *akākatte*, *akautatte**, and *akraupatte*, could be seen in the light of the initial accentuation of the underlying active or medial but always transitive subjunctive V stem forms *kākā-*, *kāutā-*, and *kráupā-*, resp. For the time being, this remains only a hypothesis, of course. Should an analysis of the formation of the remaining privatives to verbs in initial *k* or *p* provide an identical conclusion, the hypothesis is quite likely to correspond to the realities of the language.

§7.1.4.1. A note of warning must be issued concerning *klautk-*. A medial intransitive subjunctive V **klautkā-* with suffixal accentuation is not attested for certain as already has been pointed out. Only one

⁹ The prefix vocalism has been umlauted by the root vocalism, which itself has been umlauted by the suffixal *-ā-*. In Hilmarsson 1988: 47-48 I have incorrectly assumed that the verb B *kraup-*, A *krop-*, could have an original *a*-vocalism (i.e., I.-E. **kreH₂u-p/bh-*), in spite of such MQ-forms as present ptc. med. *(kre)wpemane*. I retract that view now, for I presume to see that the main support for MQ *-e-* for alleged *-ā-*, namely B MQ *kewwa* 'he killed' for standard *kauwa* to the I.-E. root **kau-* (i.e. **keH₂u-* or **kauH₂-* (cf. Rasmussen 1989: 77 with lit.), being a preterite of class III where (Toch.) *e*-vocalism is normal (and where *ā*-umlaut does not occur), can easily reflect an I.-E. *o*-grade **kou-* (i.e. **koH₂u-* or **kouH₂-* (or, perhaps less likely, an I.-E. *ē*-grade with depalatalization of the initial consonant). The MQ-form *(kre)wpemane* thus reflects (as if) an I.-E. **kro(H₂)up/bh-o-* or **krē(H₂)up/bh-o-*, and the subjunctive *kráupā-* (earlier **krāupā-*) has a regularly umlauted root vocalism.

¹⁰ This privative is attested four (or possibly five) times and its meaning ('unturning') is secure. It is found three times in collocation with *palsko* 'thought, spirit', e.g. 523 Š a4 (*añklau)tkacce* [pa]l(s)kosa 'with an unturning thought'; cf. also 583 M b3 (*añklau)tkace*, Lévi S 8 Suppl. 2 *añklautka(tte)*, and, furthermore, 222 MQR a1 *añklau)t(ace)*, and possibly a3 (*añklau)tkace*.

medial form to the subjunctive V stem of the verb *klautk-* is attested, i.e. 245 MQR b1 *kl(au)tk[o](y)[t](ră)*, and that form cannot reveal the seat of the accent. The same is true of the subjunctive derivatives: the infinitive *klautkattsī* of 350 MQR b6 and the abstract *klautkalyñ[e]* of 333 MQR a9 are inconclusive because of their MQ-origin, and *(k)[laut]k(ă)[l]ñe* of UV 2 a3 unfortunately has an unreadable suffix vocalism, i.e. either *a* or *ā*.

The present class IV – to which the verb *klautk-* belongs – characteristically contains intransitive verbs. It is regularly accompanied by subjunctive V formations. However, while the present IV has medial forms exclusively, the corresponding subjunctive V forms are almost exclusively active. Of the approximately 20 present class IV verbs only three are accompanied by medial subjunctive forms. The accentuation of these medial forms is mostly indiscernible. The verb *klautk-* forms a present IV stem *klautko-*. It is accompanied by the subjunctive V stem *klautkā-*, whose optative *kl(au)tk[o](y)[t](ră)* has already been mentioned. It cannot show the accent. Neither can the optative *spārtoytră* (to the verb *spārtt-* ‘to turn’, pres. IV *sportto-*, subj. V *spārttā-*) of 278 a1 which is an MQ text. This leaves us with the verb *ārtt-* ‘to love, praise’ (pres. IV *ortto-*, subj. V *ārttā-*) with the optative form *[ā]rt(o)y[t]ră* of 308 b1, a text from Šorčuq, which shows accent on the initial syllable. However, the accentuation of this last form is not necessarily indicative of the accentuation of all medial subjunctive V forms, for the verb *ārtt-* is one of the rare transitive verbs of present class IV. That is to say, most subjunctive V forms that accompany present class IV forms are active. Their initial accentuation (e.g. in the abstract *spārtalyñe*) is therefore normal and in accordance with the rules laid down by Marggraf. Intransitive medial forms to such subjunctives are attested only twice and in neither case can their accentuation be ascertained. There is therefore

nothing that forbids the assumption that such forms had suffixal accentuation as would comply with Marggraf's rules for the accentuation of the class V subjunctives.

§7.1.4.2. Consider also the following approach to the background of the privative *añklautkatte**. It is doubtful that the underlying verb has an original *a*-vocalism. B *klautk-* 'to turn, become; (caus.) to turn sby away / around' is obviously related to B *klutk-* 'to turn oneself (around); (caus.) to make sth happen, make sth into sth'; both have correspondences in East Tocharian, i.e. A *lotk-* 'to turn, become' which is a non-causative exclusively, and A *lutk-* 'to make happen' functioning only as a causative. The non-causative B *klutk-* forms a present of class VII (3pl. med. *kluttañkentär*) and, according to Winter (1980a: 556), there is a preterite of class Ia (3sg.) *klyutkā*; furthermore, there is the past participle *klutkau*. No subjunctive is attested and East Tocharian gives no indication of how the subjunctive of this paradigm might have been, for this verb is only attested in causative forms there. However, the paradigmatic pattern of B *klutk-* (pres. VII, pret. Ia, ptc. *klutkau*) necessitates positing a subjunctive V **klautkā-* (whose middle, if such existed, would have been a zero grade **klutkā⁻¹¹*), cf. the verbs B *kātk-* 'to cross', *nātk-* 'to support', *sālk-* 'to draw forth', all of which form nasal presents of class VII (sometimes beside the nasal class VI), subjunctives of class V, preterites of class Ia, and unreduplicated past participles in *-au*, e.g. (3sg. pres.) *kättañkāṃ*, (3sg. subj. [KVāc.]) *kātka* (beside a zero grade *kātkā-*), (1sg. pret.) *sātkāwa*, (ptc.) *kātkau*, (3sg. pres.) *nättañkāṃ*, (3sg. subj.) *nātkāṃ*, (3pl. pret.) *ñitkāre-ne*, (ptc.) *nātkau*, (3sg. med. pres.) *slāñktär*, (3sg. subj.) *sālkāṃ* (beside a zero grade *sālkā-*), (1sg. med. pret.) *sālkāmai* (an active

¹¹ I assume that **klutk-* would have been the morphological representative of the zero grade for expected **klātk-*.

preterite stem would have been **šālkā-*), (ptc.) *sālkau*. It might be suggested that the original ablauting paradigm (pres. VII) **klutāñkā-* : (subj. V) **klāutkā-* / **klutkā-* : (pret. Ia) **klyutkā-* : (ptc.) *klutkau* split in two and generated the two paradigms of, on the one hand, B *klautk-* with generalized *au*-vocalism, and, on the other hand, *klutk-* with generalized *u*-vocalism, each with a non-causative as well as a causative conjugation. The non-causative formed a present of class IV, replacing the original present VII, because the generalized subjunctive V stem *klautkā-* had radical *ā*-vocalism (through *ā*-umlaut), and the pre-existing presents of class IV all had radical *ā*-vocalisms. In East Tocharian a similar split took place, except that *lotk-* < **klautk-* was specialized as a non-causative, preserving the original present class VII conjugation, and *lutk-* < **klutk-* was specialized as a causative. The reason for the continued membership of A *lotk-* in present class VII even after the generalization of the subjunctive vocalism *-au-* > *-o-*, would have been the phenomenon that *ā*-umlaut generally does not take place in the East Tocharian subjunctive V. The stem A *lotkā-* reflects **klautkā-* from Common Toch. **klæutkā-* with no umlaut, while B *klautkā-* reflects **klāutkā-* from Common Toch. **klæutkā-* with umlaut. Now, the general condition for the operation of *ā*-umlaut in East Tocharian appears to be that it takes place in unaccented position, judging by the West Tocharian material. The lack of umlaut in A *lotkā-* < **klautkā-* would therefore indicate initial accent, i.e. Common Toch. **kléutkā-*. In West Tocharian, on the other hand, *ā*-umlaut takes place in accented and unaccented syllables alike. The umlauted B *klautkā-* could therefore reflect either Common Toch. **klæutkā-* or **kléutkā-*. One might then conclude that the combined evidence of East and West Tocharian points to a Common Toch. **kléutkā-* with radical accent. And this may indeed have been the

case in forms of the active stem. However, as this verb is intransitive, medial stem forms would have had suffixal accent, and the privative *aṅklautkatte* could be considered as formed to that stem (of course, after the generalization of the *āu*-vocalism). Cf. again the subjunctive V of the parallel verb B *kātk-* that has an active stem *kātkā-* / *kātkā-* (e.g., 355 M b4 *kerekauna k(a)tkatsi* 'to cross the stream') beside a medial stem *kātkā-* (e.g., 418 M a2 *kātkālñemem*).

The etymology of these Tocharian verbs has, in my opinion, not been resolved with certainty. Pedersen (Vgl.Gr.II 494, cf. also 1941: 171) suggested a connection with Old Irish *clo-* (3sg. *cloid*) 'to turn back; defeat', (intr.) 'to turn away', and Gk. *πολεύω* 'I turn around' (cf. also Van Windekens 1969: 195, 1976: 267); the Celtic connection was accepted by Melchert 1977: 121, but the Greek one labelled difficult. One might perhaps rather think of a connection with the Indo-European root **kleu-H-*, **kleu-d-* (see Pokorny 1959: 605 under **klēu-*, *klāu-*) as attested in Baltic and Germanic, cf. Latv. *kļūt* 'to become; attain', *kļūtas* 'fate', Lith. *kliūti* 'happen; linger, remain', OIcel. *hljóta* 'be allotted, attain', *hljótask* 'to happen, become', OE. *hléotan* 'be allotted', OS. *hliotan* 'id.', etc. For Tocharian one might then suggest an underlying **kleud-* + *-sk-* (for the change of dental + *-sk-* to Toch. *-tk-*, cf. Melchert 1977), which yielded *klyutk-*, as found in the preterite B *klyutkā*, while B *klautk(ā)-* reflects **kloud-sk-(H₂-)*, and *klutk-* is a secondary reflex of the zero grade **klud-sk-*. Of course, the apophony of this particular verb need not be of Indo-European age, and the addition of the *-sk-* suffix may have been a purely Tocharian process.

§7.2. There is no problem with the prefixal nasal in the rest of the privatives of Group Ia. It is lost quite regularly before all consonants other than *p* and *k*, and retained before a vowel. Although the privatives

of Group Ia could theoretically – if one disregards the accent – derive from either the subjunctive or the preterite stem of their verbs, they will be treated in the following as formed to the subjunctive stem. The discussion of the privatives of other groups will conclusively reveal that the preterite stem cannot have been the basic form. Thus, the remaining privatives of Group Ia are as follows:

§7.2.1. B *alaitatte** ‘not fallen away from’ is a *hapax legomenon*, attested in the Paris manuscript 1205 b1 (Couvreur 1954: 82): *alaitacci krentaunamem* ‘who have not fallen away from virtues’. It is formed to the subjunctive V *lāitā-* to the verb B *lait-* ‘to fall (off)’, cf. A *let-*, *lit-* ‘id.’. The subjunctive stem *lāitā-* has suffered *ā*-umlaut (< **lāitā-* < **læitā-*), and the umlauted root vocalism has thereupon caused *ā*-umlaut of the prefix vocalism. In West Tocharian, the radical *-ai-* of the subjunctive (and preterite) has been generalized, causing the transfer of this verb from present class III (cf. A pres. III 3pl. med. *litantār*, but subj. V 3sg. act. *letaṣ*) to present class IV (e.g. 3pl. med. *laitontrā*), cf. the generalization of the stem B *klautk-* and its present IV formation as discussed above.

§7.2.2. B *amāllatte* ‘unoppressed’ is a *hapax legomenon* attested at 255 MQ b3 *ket no pälsko kakacu amāllatte yollaintsā yamor keśā taṣṣeñca se kr̥i srauḱam śamane* ‘But [he], whose spirit is delighted, unoppressed by evil, taking account of *karma*, he lives (lit. [is] living), [even] if [he] dies’. A second occurrence may be presumed in the parallel text 254 MQR b4 [*pä*]lsko kakāccu a - - ///. B *amāllatte* is formed to the subjunctive V *māllā-* to the verb B *māl-* ‘to oppress, crush; reject’ (cf. A *māl-* ‘id.’). In the subjunctive stem, the radical vocalism has suffered *ā*-umlaut, causing, in turn, *ā*-umlaut in the prefix. The subjunctive stem

*māllā*¹² derives its geminate from the present by analogy, while the present X stem itself, B *māllāsk-*, reflects an earlier present VI **mālnā-* (through assimilation) with an *sk*-extension. A form of the past participle is attested in 159 MQ b6 *k(l)eśanmaṣṣe krāke(sa pa)ls[k]o mā m(a)[m]ā[lo]* '[who] has / have not oppressed [his / their] spirit with *kleśa*-filth' or '[whose] spirit is not oppressed with *kleśa*-filth'. Sieg and Siegling 1953: 88, fn.21, suggest here the emendation *m(a)mālo(s)*. As pointed out by Adams 1989: 15, fn.9, this participle has an unexpected shape, for one would expect here **mamālaṣ* and not *mamāloṣ**. Adams, therefore, assumes that the root vowel *-ā-* is original. This is improbable, however. For one thing, the etymological connection of this Tocharian verb with Lith. *mālti* 'crush, grind', Hitt. *mall(i)-* 'to crush', Lat. *molō* 'I grind', etc., can hardly be doubted, and this root shows the normal ablaut forms **mel-H₂-*, **mol-H₂-*, **m_{l̥}-H₂-*, but no ascertainable **mal-H₂-*. And second, Sieg and Siegling's emendation to **m(a)mālo(s)* may well be incorrect: the suffixal *-o-* could be an MQ-variant for standard *-au-*; i.e., the form may have to be read **m(a)mālo* for standard (nom. sg. masc.) **mamālau*, or **m(a)mālowa* / **m(a)mālosa* for standard (nom. pl. neut.) **mamālauwa* / (nom. sg. fem.) **mamālausa*. If so, the radical *ā*-vocalism is normal and due to umlaut. The preterite stem *mālā-* beside the present **mālnā-(sk)-* and the subjunctive **mālā-* (secondarily **mālnā- > māllā-**) would indicate a paradigm quite parallel to B present **pālnā- > pāllā-*, subjunctive *pālā-*, preterite *pālā-*.

§7.2.3. *amāntatte* 'not agitated, unscattered(?)' is also a *hapax legomenon*, found at H 149. add. 63/59 b5 *ket palskw=astare [a]māntatte ta[ka](r)[šk](e)* 'whose spirit [is] pure, not scattered(?), [and] clear'. This privative is formed to the subjunctive V *māntā-* to the verb B *mānt-* 'to

¹² The accent cannot be seen, because this stem occurs only in MQ-texts; presumably, it lay on the initial syllable.

scatter, throw; hurt, injure' (cf. A *mānt-* 'to injure'). Krause 1952: 42 translates *[a]māntatte* with "nicht zornig", while Broomhead 1962b: 9 has "amiable, not quarrelsome" and 1962a: 151 "not irascible". Thomas points out that in a certain Pāṭayantika-fragment of the Berlin collection (published by Thomas 1987; note esp. p. 173) Toch. B *mānt-* is used to translate Skt. *sic-* 'to sprinkle, spread'. From this it might be gathered that *[a]māntatte* could have the meaning 'unscattered, concentrated', or the like. The radical *-ā-* has, of course, been umlauted, and has itself caused umlaut of the prefix vocalism. The West Tocharian subjunctive V *māntā-* is accompanied by a present XII *māntāññā-*, which appears to have mostly replaced an original present VI that is attested with an unexpected full grade in the form 3sg. *mintanaṃ*, cf. Thomas, *l.c.* It seems likely, however, that this verb did not form an *n*-present originally, but was simply a root-verb in final laryngeal (possibly I.-E. **mentH₂-* as suggested by Thomas, *l.c.*), forming a present V, i.e. Common Toch. **m'āntā-*, that is preserved in East Toch. *māntā-* (e.g. 1sg. *māntām*) but replaced by an *n*-present in West Tocharian (retaining the full grade vocalism of the original radical *ā*-present, i.e. B *mintāñā-* < **m'āntāñā-* ← **m'āntā-*). The West Tocharian subjunctive V *māntā-*, on the other hand, reflects an Indo-European perfect **me-montH₂-* through Common Toch. **māntā-*. The initial accent of this stem is shown by forms like the B infinitive (596 Š b5) *māntatsi*. Contrarily, the East Tocharian abstract *māntlune* (frequently attested) appears to indicate a subjunctive V stem **māntā-* with suffixal accent, for, as pointed out above, *ā*-umlaut appears not to take place in that language, unless the affected syllable was unaccented. The abstract A *māntlune* < **māntālune* has the meaning 'evil-mindedness', and thus derives from the medial subjunctive stem, cf. Krause 1952: 266, Thomas and Krause 1964: 125,

K. T. Schmidt 1969: 163 for the different meanings of AB *mānt-* in the active and the middle. One would expect that a subjunctive V, whose radical vocalism was not an original Tocharian *-ā-*, would show ablaut and form an active with full grade and a middle with zero grade vocalism. An intransitive middle would furthermore be expected to have suffixal accent. Thus, beside the active Common Toch. **mæntā-*, one would posit an intransitive middle **māntā̃-*. In this particular verb, however, zero grade middle forms seem to have been replaced by full grade forms in the subjunctive and in the preterite. Thus, in East Tocharian, the preterite shows such middle forms as 3sg. *māntat* and 3pl. *māntant*, while in West Tocharian one finds a subjunctive middle form like 3sg. (331 S a1) *māntatār-ne*. It might then be suggested that the abstract A *māntlune* derives from a subjunctive V middle stem **māntā̃-* with regular umlaut, deriving from Common Toch. **mæntā̃-*, that has replaced an earlier **māntā̃-*. The West Tocharian middle forms also show replacement of the radical vocalism and have generalized the initial accent of transitive forms. — There are still unsolved problems concerning this verb; note, e.g., the stem form *māntā̃-* of the B abstract *māntalle*. However, it would take us too far from the scope of this study to pursue that further.

§7.2.4. B *amaukatte** ‘unceasing, (Krause 1952: 42) unablässig’ is attested three times.¹³ It is formed to the subjunctive V *maukā-* (probably attested at 591 S b6) to the verb B *mauk-* ‘to cease, leave off, let be, (Krause 1942: 269) ablassen’ (A *muk-*). In West Tocharian, all known forms of this verb have full grade vocalism (subj. V *maukā-*, pret. Ibß *maukā̃-*, causative pres. IX *māukäṣṣä-*; deverbative noun *mauki* ‘end’), but in view of A *muk-* (found only in the preterite 2sg.

¹³ 231 M a3 *cai onolmi amaukacci yolosa* ‘these beings, unceasing in evil’; also 324 M a3, Ot I 2 b1.

mukāšt) it seems likely that the full grade is secondary in the preterite. In the subjunctive there may have been an alternation originally between Common Toch. active **mæukā-* and an intransitive middle **mākā-* replaced by **mukā-*. At any rate, the prefix vocalism of B *amaukatte** has been regularly umlauted, and so has the radical vocalism; i.e. B *amaukatte** < **æ(n)māukātte* < **æ(n)mæukātte*, not from original **æ(n)māukātte*. Etymologically, this verb is probably correctly associated with Skt. *muñcāti* 'he releases', etc., by Van Windekens 1976: 306.

§7.2.5. B *anautatte** 'not-waning, not-disappearing' is a further *hapax legomenon* attested at 291 MQR a2 *w[e]ñim ñās anautac[=ai]śamñesa mā āroy wentsi* /// 'I would reply: "Because of [his] not-waning knowledge, he would not cease speaking"'. This privative is formed to the subjunctive V *nāūtā-* to the verb B *naut-* 'to vanish' (cf. A *nut-* 'id.'). In the subjunctive stem the radical vocalism has suffered *ā*-umlaut, causing, in turn, *ā*-umlaut in the prefix. The translation of *anautatte** with 'not-waning, not-disappearing' seems preferable to 'not destroyed' (Krause 1952: 42 "unzerstört"), because this privative is clearly formed to the non-causative *nāūtā-* ('to disappear') and not to the causative *nāūtāššā-* ('to destroy').

The non-causative of the verb B *naut-* is attested as a subjunctive V *nāūtā-* and a preterite Ibß *nāūtā-* with the past participle *nanautau*. However, in view of the East Tocharian past participle *nuto* (presupposing a preterite stem **nutā-*), the West Tocharian preterite formation is probably secondary, having replaced an earlier **nutā-*, accompanied by a participle **nutau*. No present stem is directly attested in either language. The East Tocharian causative present VIII stem (3sg. *nutāš*, inf. *nutāssi*) could – but need not necessarily – imply a non-

causative present I, because causatives of class VIII are found beside various types of non-causatives presents. And the West Tocharian adjectives (nom. pl. fem.) *nuttsāna* and (nom. sg. masc.) *nuttse*, *nauttse* ‘disappearing’ (showing the generalized *-au-*) need not imply an athematic verbal stem **nutā-* that would have to be seen as a present stem.¹⁴ Indeed, the overwhelming majority of intransitive verbs with subjunctives of class V and preterites of class Iaß form presents of class III. Typical are BA *māsk-* ‘to be’ and BA *sruk-* ‘to die’. The original paradigm of B *naut-*, A *nut-*, may therefore have been: pres. III **nutā-*, subj. V (act.) **nāutā-* / **nūtā-*, (med.) **nutā-*, pret. Iaß **nutā-*, past ptc. **nutāwā*. It is conceivable that beside the present III there was a present I **nutā-*, cf. B pres. I *yumāne* ‘maturing’ beside A pres. III *ywatsi* ‘to be inclined’ (see discussion of this verb in §16.2.2), and the adjective B *nuttse* might derive from such a present – albeit, not directly, but rather through the intermediary of a root noun **nut*, for adjectives in *-(ts)tse* are not formed to verbs (cf. again the discussion in §16.2.2 and the example B *śāmpāsse* [for *śāmpāts(ts)e*] directly formed to *śāmpa* [obl.] ‘arrogance’ but only secondarily to the verb *śāmp-* ‘to be arrogant’). On the other hand, it is not clear that a root noun **nut* must presuppose an

¹⁴ B *nauttse* is glossed with ‘vernichtend’ by Krause 1952: 256, while B *nuttse* is glossed with ‘hinfällig’ by Thomas and Krause 1964: 204. Broomhead 1962b: 144 has ‘destroying, getting rid of’ for both. As the underlying **nut*, if deverbative at all, must be formed to the intransitive non-causative, and, therefore, would have had the meaning ‘disappearance’, it is likely that Thomas and Krause have given the correct translation of the denominative adjective *nuttse* (and *nauttse* which I assume has a secondarily generalized vocalism), i.e. ‘disappearing, going away, (Germ.) hinfällig’. It seems that the collocation of *nuttse* / *nauttse* with a verb meaning ‘to become’ (*klautk-*, *māsk-*) had in West Tocharian the meaning ‘to disappear, to go away’. This is clear in Lévi K 3 b2 *empelona ra yāmwa tākam yāmornta aīm-nakālñesa nuttsāna pest klautkontr* ‘Even though dreadful deeds have been done, by [means of] self-reproach they disappear’. Cf. also W 14 b2 *śār kātsasa walanalle śānmāṣṣälle cañkene* [or *cañke te* ?] *nauttse māsketār* ‘On the stomach a covering is to be bound. In the womb [the pain] disappears’ (or: ‘In the womb it disappears’); similarly 214 MQR b1 *cāñke nauttse*. The text PK 12 L a2 with the form B *nuttse* (Broomhead, *l.c.*) is not accessible to me.

athematic verb stem, cf. the noun B *lāms* 'service' to the verb *lāms-* 'to perform' with pres. and subj. II *lāmsā-*.

Although the comparison of B *naut-* and A *nut-* thus leads us to assume an original paradigmatic pattern such as described above, the fact that West Tocharian has innovated in the preterite by introducing there the stem *nautā-* for earlier **nutā-* may have entailed the replacement of an earlier present III **nute-* by a present IV **nauto-*, i.e. a transfer of a verb with generalized *ā*-vocalism to the class whose members all have a radical *ā*-vocalism (cf. the discussion of *aiwo-* in §16.2.2 below). It was assumed above that the *ā*-vocalism in this verb was due to *ā*-umlaut in the subjunctive. On the basis of the generally accepted etymology of this verb, however, one might wonder, whether *ā*-vocalism was not always inherent in it. It was Lane 1938: 27 (= 1967: 10) who first suggested that B *naut-*, A *nut-*, be etymologically associated with the group of Goth. *naus*, OCS. *navī* 'corpse', Latv. *nāve* 'death', etc., approvingly cited by Van Windekens 1976: 322. These words derive from Pokorny's **nāu-* : **nəu-* : **nū-* 'death, corpse' and 'to exhaust, exhaust oneself' (Pokorny 1959: 756). It seems clear to me that at least two Tocharian words must be tied in with this root. Thus A *nwām* 'weak, exhausted' (obl. sg. *nwāmānt*) must surely repose on the zero grade **nuH₂-* plus a suffixal **-ment-* / **-mont-* / **-mpt-* (cf. already Duchesne-Guillemin 1941: 151, and Van Windekens 1941: 76, 1976: 322, whose morphological interpretation is different). Furthermore, B *onuwaññe* 'immortal; eternity', wrongly analysed by Van Windekens 1976: 336-337, was correctly associated by Van Windekens 1968: 411 with Goth. *naus*, etc, although again his morphological and phonological analysis left much to be desired. As proposed in Hilmarsson 1986: 28, B *onuwaññe* reflects

Common Toch. **æn-nuwā-ñ-yæ* as if from I.-E. **ǵ-nuH₂-n-jo-*, cf. Old Ir. *nūne / naune* 'famine', etc. (cf. further discussion of this word in §17.2.3). These two words, A *nwām* and B *onuwaññe*, unmistakably show the reflex of a zero grade **nuH₂-*. As implied above, A *nut-* (as well as B **nut-*) can be taken as a morphological zero grade reflex beside the original *o*-grade B *naut-*. The zero grade *nut-* would have replaced a "correct" zero grade **nāt-* < I.-E. **nuT-*. That is to say, A *nut-* appears to reflect a preform with no laryngeal, and the same might be said of B *naut-* which appears to reflect a non-laryngeal **nout-* or **naut-*. Of course, there is the possibility that the Indo-European root had the form **neH₂u-(T-)* (cf. perhaps **keH₂u-(T-)* 'to hew, hammer', §7.1.2, fn. 8), whose perfect **noH₂u-(T-)* resulted regularly in Common Toch. **næut-*, entailing the replacement of the reflex of the zero grade **nuH₂-T-* in the present stem (a form with regular laryngeal metathesis as found in the non-verbal A *nwām* and B *onuwaññe*) by a new zero grade **nut-* harmonizing with **næut-*. But this is only one of several possible alternatives; e.g. it is conceivable that there were two different (but related) roots, I.-E. **nauH₂- : *nuH₂-* (yielding A *nwām*, B *onuwaññe*) and I.-E. **naud- : *nud-*, comparable in structure with putative I.-E. **kauH₂-* and **kaud-*, cf. §7.1.2 with footnote 8. To I.-E. **naud-* there would be the perfect **noud-* > Common Toch. **næut-ā-* > B *nāutā-*, and the present **nud-* > Common Toch. **nāt-* replaced by **nut-*.¹⁵

§7.2.6. B *aspāwatte** 'not-subsiding, not-withdrawing' is attested only twice in poorly preserved texts, to wit 146 MQR a1 (*cme*)*lāš[e]* *mā(nt) r[e]ššām aspa(watte)* '[it] streams as [the] not-subsiding birth[-

¹⁵ The reader will have noticed that I do not assume that I.-E. **d* was lost intervocalically before a non-palatalizing vowel in Tocharian. I shall not argue that point here, but leave it for a later occasion.

stream]', and 147 MQR frgm. 8 *aspāwa(tte)* without any context. The posited meaning of this privative is only a guess (cf. Krause 1953: 43 "unversiegbar"), but it has a fair chance of being correct in view of the underlying verb B *spāw-* that, although it is attested only once in a broken context, may be reasonably translated with 'to subside, withdraw', for it occurs beside the verb *tsānk-* 'to arise' and can be taken as its antonym (H 149. 81 a3 *tseñketār spowotrā* 'arises [and] subsides'), cf. in a similar vein, Jasanoff 1978: 27 "*spāw-* 'run dry (?)'". The present IV conjugation of *spāw-* might be taken as an indication that this verb has an original *ā*-vocalism, and therefore *ā*-umlaut only in the prefix. The present IV *spowo-* must, of course, have been accompanied by a subjunctive of class V **spāwā-*.

The only attempt at an etymological explanation of B *spāw-* that I am aware of is that of Van Windekens 1976: 439. His derivation from an I.-E. **sup-ōyo-* 'sleep' cannot be termed successful. As it seems not unlikely that *spāw-* (pres. IV *spowo-*) has an original radical *ā*-vocalism, it is perhaps conceivable to associate this verb with Germ. **spanwōn* (OHG. *spannan* 'to stretch, draw out', etc.) < I.-E. **spH₂-n-ū-* to a **speH₂-ū-* : **spH₂-ū-*, cf. also Gk. *σπάω* 'to draw, pull' < **πα-σ-ω* with *-σ-* from the aorist *σπάσαι* to an I.-E. **spH₂-*. Such an association might be claimed, if B *spāw-* basically means 'to draw away, to withdraw'.

§7.2.7. B *atākatte* 'untrue, unfounded, (Skt.) *abhūta*' is well attested.¹⁶ This privative is formed to the subjunctive V *tākā-*, which together with the preterite Ibß *tākā-*, forms a part of the suppletive paradigm of B *nes-* 'to be', cf. A *nas-*, *tākā-*. While it has been generally

¹⁶ The attestations are at 15 Š a5-6 *a(tāka)tte*, b8 *atā(ka)tte*, 16 Š a4 *(a)tākatte*, b6 *(at)[ā]ka[tt]e*, 17 Š a7 *atākatte*, b6 *≠tāka[cc]e*, 18 Š a3 *atākatte*.

agreed that *tākā-* continues a pre-Tocharian formation of the type Gk. (aor.) ἔθηκα 'I put', (perf.) ἔστηκα 'I have taken position', its precise etymology has been a matter of some dispute. Hermann's (1922: 307) association of *tākā-* with Gk. ἔθηκα is embraced by Van Windekens 1976: 495-496, cf. also Isebaert 1980: 155, whereas Pedersen 1941: 194 (also Sapir apud Sturtevant 1940: 273), on account of the East Tocharian imperative form *pāštāk* 'be!', preferred an association with Gk. ἔστηκα. The latter view is also propounded by Pinault 1989: 133sq. in a very lucid account of the different forms of the Tocharian verb 'to be'. I agree with the latter proposal, not only because of the imperative *A pāštāk*, but also because I think the subjunctives of class V in principle continue Indo-European perfects (or more precisely, the Proto-Indo-European category that the Indo-European perfect and the Anatolian *hi*-conjugation are continuants of, cf. Cowgill 1979). I assume *tākā-* continues either a full grade I.-E. **ste-stoH₂-k-* or a zero grade **ste-stH₂-k-*.¹⁷ In either case the Common Tocharian outcome was **tāk-ā-*. While the reduplication syllable was regularly lost in all Indo-European perfects continued in the subjunctive class V¹⁸, one may only speculate on the loss of the sibilant in Tocharian **tāk-ā-*. I propose that the reduplication syllable of this verb was in Tocharian reduced to **te-* as in

¹⁷ Gk. ἔστηκα has a generalized *-ā-* for expected *-ω-* < **-oH₂-*.

¹⁸ That is, the reduplication was lost because of the syncope of *-ā-* in open and unaccented syllables (leaving the subjunctive V stem with a typical root accent; a similar view was expressed by Winter at the Berlin Fachtagung of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft, September 1990) and because of the phenomenon that a subsequently arising initial geminate (reduplication consonant plus radical consonant – the former possibly having been previously adjusted to the latter with regard to the palatal / non-palatal factor) was, of course, simplified. The preservation of the perfect reduplication syllable in the past participle of certain types of verbs was accomplished through a secondary lengthening of the reduplication vowel, the details of which do not concern us here.

Indic and not to *se- as in Latin or Greek¹⁹. I can think of two alternatives of further development. First, because of the strive to make the reduplication and root initial consonants identical²⁰, the simplification of *ste- to *te- entailed the loss of the radical sibilant as well. One might suggest that this could have happened in the following manner: The loss of the reduplication vowel in open syllables was followed by its analogical loss in closed syllables as well; the reduplication consonant, having been adjusted to the non-palatal initial consonantism of the root, was at this time non-palatal, that is the form was *tāstākā- which changed to *tstākā- through the generalization of the syncope of the reduplication vowel; the initial geminate that arose as a consequence of the syncope was immediately simplified, and it is conceivable that in the form *tstākā- a wrong analysis interpreted the sequence *ts- as the affricate [ts] and that it was removed as such in one, leaving the subjunctive form *tākā-. The second alternative is in my opinion more lucrative: At the time of the syncope the palatalized reduplication consonant had still not been depalatalized on the analogy of the radical initial; the form was *čāstākā- which was syncopated to *čstākā-; the -s- was assimilated and interpreted as an organic part of the affricate which resulted in the form *čtākā-; when the reduplication consonantism was finally removed (through assimilation / adjustment to the radical initial) *čtākā- resulted inescapably in *tākā-.

¹⁹ Such a simplification of the reduplication syllable is confirmed by the West Tocharian past participles *paspārtau*, (caus.) *pešpirttu*, to B *spārtt-* 'to turn', and *pešpirtu* (caus.) to B *spānt-* 'to be confident', while in A *sāspārtwu*, (caus.) *sāspārtwšu*, to A *spārtw-* 'to turn', the "normal" identity of reduplication and radical initial consonants has been restored. B *stastaukkau* to *staukk-* 'to tire' and B *šcešcamor* (caus.) to *stāni-* 'to put up, confirm' have also secondarily reshaped their reduplication syllables.

²⁰ Although the reduplication syllable has been lost in all subjunctives V, the strive for an identity of the reduplication and root initial consonants is clearly demonstrated in the past participles and in the originally presentic B *tāttā-* (not *tsāttā-).

Through this latter alternative an explanation of the preservation of the sibilant in the East Tocharian imperative *pāštāk* becomes possible – in particular, if seen in connection with the fact that here the stem is preceded by the imperative prefix. That is, the preform was **p'äcāstākā-*, accented on the reduplication syllable. The affricate, therefore, was never contiguous to the initial sibilant of the root. When the reduplication syllable was lost (more or less regularly) in the basic subjunctive form, it was removed analogically in its derivate, the imperative, leaving its initial radical sibilant in tact, i.e. **p'äcāstākā- → p'āstākā- > A pāštāk*; in West Tocharian the imperative (*ptāka*, *ptākas*) has been entirely renewed on the basis of the subjunctive. — As for the preterite stem B *tākā-*, A *tākā-*, it is in my opinion simply based on the subjunctive stem, having received analogically the accentuation proper to preterites of class I.

§7.2.8. B *awāskatte* 'not-stirring, calm' is attested several times²¹ and its meaning is assured. It is formed to a subjunctive V stem **wāskā-* to the verb listed as B *wāsk-* 'to move, stir' (intrans.), cf. A *wāsk-* 'id.'. The accentuation of this subjunctive stem is not shown by the attested West Tocharian forms, for the only ones that could show it are found in MQ-texts (147 MQR frgm. 9 *waskāmo*, 245 MQR b4 *waskamo*) and are, therefore, ambiguous as to accentuation. In East Tocharian, on the other hand, there is the subjunctive V abstract *wāsklune* that – because of its *ā*-umlauted vocalism – would indicate a suffixally accented **wāskā-*, unless, of course, this verb has an original *ā*-vocalism. The latter is

²¹ The attestations are as follows: 72 § 3 *awāskacca ramt ysāš[ša]* (*tapākye*) 'as a calm, golden (mirror)' (Thomas 1983: 228), 229 MQR a3 [*sā*]*kā lakles=āwāskacce wārsā ite* 'full with water unstirred by pleasure [and] pain', 235 MQR a1 *aw(ā)sk(a)[t]t(e)*, 243 MQ a4 (*awā*)*skatte*, H 149. 296 b8 *awāskatte* 'immobile(?)', PK NS 107 b4 (*ra*)[*mt*] (*a*)[*wā*]*skatte yolme* 'like a calm pond' in which (*a*)[*wā*]*skatte* translates Skt. *aparakampayaḥ* '(Germ.) unbeweglich, unerschütterlich', cf. Thomas 1976: 111-112.

unlikely, however, for *ā*-verbs do not ablaut in Tocharian, and there is reason to believe that the verb *wāsk-* alternates with *wāsk-*. Surprisingly, it has not been acknowledged, as far as I am aware, that the West Tocharian present XII stem of this verb must contain the root form *wāsk-*. The present is attested six times (always in the 3rd sg.). Four times we find the stem *wāskāññā-*: 143 MQR b1 *wāskāntrā*, 606 Š 2 *wāskāntrā*, Lévi U 25 a6 (= H 149. add. 124 a6) *wāskāntrā*, TX 4 a5 (Thomas 1974: 91) *wāskāntrā*. In the two remaining instances, Lévi U 18 b2 *wa(s)kantr*, and Lévi U 25 a3 (= H. 149. add. 124 a3) *wāskāntr*, we find *wāsk-*. However, in view of the four instances of *wāsk-*, two of which were so read by Sieg and Sieglings, and one by Thomas (and one by Lévi), the two divergent readings by Lévi should perhaps not be accredited with much weight. It is known that Lévi's editions are in need of extensive corrections.²²

The present XII *wāskāññā-* beside subjunctive V **wāskā-* makes the verb B *wāsk-* / *wāsk-* parallel in its paradigmatic pattern to the verb B *mānt-* / *mānt-* (pres. XII *māntāññā-*, subj. V *māntā-*) discussed above, and the privative *awāskatte* parallel to *amāntatte*. And in the same manner as East Tocharian has a subjunctive V derivative *māntlune* with an unexpectedly umlauted vocalism in view of the West Tocharian initially accented subjunctive stem *māntā-*, and, therefore, possibly, indicates a stem **māntā-* with suffixal accent, so we find A *wāsklune* with umlaut which might suggest that there was a subjunctive stem **wāskā-* beside a possible **wāskā-*. As in the case of **māntā-* for **māntā-*, it might be suggested that **wāskā-* has replaced a subjunctive V middle stem **wāskā-*. – In East Tocharian the present formation is of

²² Thomas 1971: 40, commenting on the Udānavarga text edited by Lévi, remarks in this connection that he has not seen a photo of the text, and, therefore, has not been able to verify, whether *wāsk-* is a correct reading here.

class VI²³ *wāsānkā-*. Melchert 1977: 101 suggests very plausibly that the West Tocharian present XII conjugation of this verb has replaced an earlier one of class VI (in his definition class VII) as found in East Tocharian, and, furthermore, that class VI points here to an earlier class IV A **waskatār* (as B *klautkotār* would, in his opinion, indicate that A class VI *lotānkā-* has replaced class IV A **lotka-*). I do not agree with the latter suggestion. First, it was shown above that the present stem of our verb was built on a root form *wāsk-* not *wāsk-* which excludes a membership in class IV (but would, of course, allow membership in the complementary class III), and, second, the discussion in §7.1.4sq. of the verb B *klautk-* (and / *klutk-*), A *lotk-* (and / *lutk-*), revealed that this verb is a secondary intruder in class IV, having originally belonged in a paradigm with present VII (B pres. VII = A pres. VI) formation. It is likely that A *wāsānkā-* has preserved the original present conjugation of this verb, except that – judging by B *wāskāññā-* – the radical *ā*-vocalism has been generalized in East Tocharian. A zero grade root vocalism is also what one would expect in a nasal present. The nasal present accompanied by a subjunctive V would indicate an original preterite formation of class Iaβ rather than the attested Ibβ, and a past participle **wāskau* rather than the attested *wawāskau*. That is, *wāsk-* had a paradigm parallel to *kātk-* ‘to cross’, cf. again the discussion in §7.1.4.2 of B *klautk-*, etc. The tendency to generalize the (umlauted) *ā*-vocalism of the subjunctive in the preterite and even in the present stem can be observed in many Tocharian verbs.

²³ See the classification of verbs of classes VI and VII in Krause and Thomas 1960: 203-206. In the case of the East Tocharian verbs that insert a nasal between the two constituents of the suffixes *-tk-* and *-sk-*, it would be more appropriate to consider them as belonging to class VII rather than class VI, even though they are athematic. Note that some of the West Tocharian verbs of class VII have athematic forms beside the thematic ones. However, in the present study Krause and Thomas’s classification will be maintained.

Etymologically, BA *wāsk-*, i.e. more correctly B *wāsk-*, *wāsk-*, A *wāsk-*, has usually been derived from the Indo-European root **uegh-* 'to conduct, convey' (Van Windekens 1941: 155, 1976: 552-553 with lit.). Melchert 1977: 109 suggests that one should rather see a relationship with the Germanic family of Goth. *ga-wagjan* 'to shake' (caus. to *ga-wigan** 'move, shake'), OE. *wecgan* 'id.', OHG. *weggen* 'id.', OE. *wegan* 'be in motion', OHG. *wegen* 'move', comparing further Lat. *vexāre* 'shake' and Homeric *γαιήροχος* 'earth-shaking'. And he agrees with Meillet (Mél. Andler 249f.; *non vidi*) that these forms should be attributed to a separate root **uegh-* 'shake, set in motion'. Phonologically this is possible, of course. The subjunctive **wāskā-* < **wāskā-* < **wāskā-* would reflect (as if) an Indo-European perfect **(ue-)uogh-*, extended with *-sk-* and the subjunctive marker *-ā-*. And in the present stem, *wāsk-* would reflect a zero grade **ugh-* rather than a depalatalized full grade **uegh-*.

However, while one might be prepared to see in Lat. *vexāre* more or less the equivalent of Toch. B *wāks-* 'to be uneasy' (pres. III *wāksetār*)²⁴, one might consider the possibility that *wāsk-*, *wāsk-*, could be associated with the family of OCS. *dvignōti* 'to move', OCRuss. *dvigatisja* 'id.', etc.²⁵ The Slavonic forms would derive from I.-E. **dūi-g-* (through Winter's lengthening) and might be further associated with I.-E. **dyei-* : **duoi-* as found in Gk. *δείδω* 'I fear', etc. To account for the Tocharian forms, one might posit a Proto-Toch. **dūig-sk-* which would regularly result in Common Toch. **wāsk-* through loss of **d*

²⁴ B *wāks-* is grouped with BA *wāsk-* by Van Windekens 1976: 553, who derives both from the root **uegh-*. He fails to mention Lat. *vexāre*, however.

²⁵ Previous etymological explanations of this Slavonic family of words leave much to be desired. Most popular has been the comparison with Germ. **twikkjōn*, cf. OE. *twiccian* 'to twitch', etc., cf., e.g., Ślawski (ed.) 1984: 127, but as the basic meaning of the Germanic words seems to have been 'to pinch, pluck', *vel sim.*, cf. Lühr 1988: 175, this does not appear very promising.

before *-u-, change of *i to *ä and no (or rather [?], lost) palatalization of *w by *i. The subjunctive and preterite stems have generalized the originally presentic -sk̥-suffix. The radical ā-grade of these stems cannot reflect an i-diphthong, of course, and must be seen as analogical on the pattern described by Adams 1978, esp. p. 447-448; that is, on the pattern of CäC / C'äC ~ CæC / C'æC < *CC / *CeC ~ *CoC / *CēC new full grades C'æC / CæC could be formed to the zero grades C'äC / CäC < *CiC / *CuC. As the palatalizing effect of *i > ä upon a preceding labial was soon diminished or lost altogether, a secondary full grade formed to the zero grade *wäsk- < *w'isk- < *duig-sk̥- would be *wæsk-, the basis of the umlauted subjunctive V *wāskā-.

§7.2.9. B *awlāwatte** 'uncontained, not disciplined' is attested twice. In spite of the fragmentary condition of both texts, the meaning is assured through the corresponding Sanskrit texts. Thus H 149. 236 b3 *pāṣ[ṣo](r)ñ(e)ntan(e) no a[w]lā(watte)* translates Skt. *śīleṣu tv asaṁāhitaḥ* (Sieg 1931: 498)²⁶, and Lévi U 8 b1 (= H add. 149. 96 b1 – actually rather b4, cf. Thomas 1971: 17) */// awlāwa(tte) ///* translates Skt. *asaṁyataḥ*. This privative is formed to the subjunctive V *wlāwā-* to the verb B *wlāw-* 'to be in control of oneself, to be contained' (cf. A *wlāw-* 'id.'), cf. Sieg and Sieglings 1949: 174 "sammeln, beherrschen, zügeln", Krause 1952: 293 "sich beherrschen", Van Windekens 1976: 576 "se contenir, se maîtriser".²⁷

Van Windekens' association (*l.c.*) of this word with B *wālts-* 'to crush', B *yaltse*, A *wālts* 'thousand', Gk. *εἰλέω* 'to press together', and

²⁶ Sieg suggests *a[w]lā(wätte)*, but the correct form must be *a[w]lā(watte)*, as confirmed by the second occurrence; so read by Thomas 1971: 28.

²⁷ Cf e.g., B 26 Š a7 */// ṣ(e)k indrinta wawlāwau* '(who) constantly has controlled the senses', Lévi A 1 b5 *keklyauṣormem mrauskāte mamrauskau wlawāte palsko* 'having heard (the Buddha's pronouncement), he felt disgust (for the world); disgusted, (his) spirit was contained', H 149. 290 b1 *[k]sa palsko mā wlāwatār taisa te oko [w](ä)ṛpanatār* '(if) the spirit is not contained, this result is experienced thereby', etc.

several other Tocharian forms (including B *walo*, A *wäl*, 'king') is unacceptable.

If one may assume a semantic development from 'to cover, enclose' to 'to restrict, contain' in this word – a banal development witnessed in many languages, cf. Oİcel. *hamr* 'covering, skin' vs. *hemja* 'to restrict, contain' (Germ. *hemmen*) – Toch. BA *wlāw-* can be associated with Ved. *ūrṇóti* (*vṛṇóti*), etc., and Gk. *εἰλύω* 'to cover' etc. The Vedic word is listed by Grassmann 1976⁵: 1319 with the following meanings: 1. "eng umschließen, einschließen, gefangen halten", 2. "hemmen, aufhalten", 3. "fern halten", 4. "bedecken, verhüllen", etc., the second of which would result from a parallel semantic development to that of the Tocharian verbs. It is conceivable that one may glimpse the meaning 'bedecken, einschließen' in one context in Tocharian, viz. B 243 MQ b4 *po wlawātai anaiśai [ka]ccāp ram no ṣaṇ ly[ñ]ā ///* 'you were completely (and) carefully covered / locked in (= contained) like a tortoise in its own shell(?)'.²⁸

It was pointed by Rasmussen 1989: 78-79 that the *ūr-* of Ved. *ūrṇóti* and the long *-ū-* of Gk. (Hom. perfect med.) *εἰλύμαι* must indicate an original root with both a laryngeal and a *u*-extension, i.e., an I.-E. **uelHu-*. Thus, Ved. *ūrṇóti* would reflect **u_lH-né-u-ti* (for the development of the initials, cf. Ved. *ūrṇā* 'wool' < **H₂u_lH-ne-H₂*), and Gk. *εἰλύμαι* would reflect **ue-u_luH-* with metathesis of the two final radical elements (whereas Gk. *ἐλντρον* 'container' would reflect a form with no metathesis). A confirmation of this analysis may now be seen in the Tocharian verbs in question. An Indo-European zero grade perfect

²⁸ K. T. Schmidt 1969: 307 translates here 'hast du dich ganz sorgfältig beherrscht wie eine Schildkröte (in) ihrer Schale(?)', but 'warst du bedeckt' or 'warst du eingeschlossen' seems to yield more sense in this context.

middle stem $*\mu e-\mu l H \mu$ -²⁹ would regularly yield the Tocharian subjunctive (middle) stem $*w'\bar{a}-wl\bar{a}w-\bar{a}-$, which, after the adjustment of the reduplication consonantism to the radical one (i.e., here, simply the loss of palatalization), and the subsequent loss of the reduplication syllable through syncope and simplification of the resulting initial geminate, produced the attested stem BA $wl\bar{a}w\bar{a}-$ (note that the initial $w-$ is not lost before $-l-$ in this form as it was in, say, B $\bar{l}\bar{a}nt$, the obl. sg. to $walo$ 'king', because in $wl\bar{a}w\bar{a}-$ the $w-$ is not in an originally initial position, having been preceded by the reduplication syllable). A full grade $*\mu e-\mu lo H \mu$ - (and a metathesized $*\mu e-\mu lo \mu H-$ would presumably have resulted in Toch. $*wl\bar{a}w\bar{a}-$ as well, but the constant medial conjugation of the Tocharian forms recommends positing a zero grade – and besides, this root formed a thème I type full grade $*\mu e l H \mu$ - and $*\mu o l H \mu$ - in the aorist (cf. Ved. $\acute{a}var$) and the perfect (cf. Ved. $vav\bar{a}ra$) resp.

There is no present stem attested to either West or East Tocharian $wl\bar{a}w-$. However, as the $-\bar{a}-$ of this verb – by the analysis given above – reflects a laryngeal and is not caused by umlaut, it would seem likely that its present formation would have been of class IV. Such a hypothetical present stem would probably not have been original though, for the testimony of Vedic ($\bar{u}r\bar{m}\acute{o}ti$) and Greek ($\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega < *\mu l H_i-n-u-$, cf. Gk. $\epsilon\nu\rho\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma < *\mu l H_i u-$ [§18.1.8]) indicates a nasal present $*\mu l H_i-n(e)-\mu$ -.

There is a verb in Tocharian with the meaning 'to cover, hide' that can be seen as related to BA $wl\bar{a}w-$. This is BA $w\bar{a}l-$. Attested are B pres. VI $w\bar{a}l\bar{a}n\bar{a}-$, subj. V $w\bar{a}l\bar{a}-$, pret. Ibß $w\bar{a}l\bar{a}-$, past ptc. $waw\bar{a}lau$, A pret. Ibß $w\bar{a}l\bar{a}-$, past ptc. $w\bar{a}wlu$. It has been correctly associated with Gk. $\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega$, etc. cf. Van Windekens 1976: 552 (with lit.), whose morphological analysis is quite wrong, however.

²⁹ The laryngeal here is uncertain. I suggest $*H_i$ on account of Gk. $\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega$, cf. below.

It might be suggested that Toch. BA *wāl-* and BA *wlāw-* originally belonged to one and the same paradigm that in Tocharian has suffered a secondary split – possibly on account of the semantic specialization of the preform of BA *wlāwā-* in the sense ‘to contain, restrict’. There are no nasal infix presents of the type **-ne-u-* / **-n-u-* in Tocharian³⁰. One could assume that they have been partly replaced by presents of the type **-ne-H-* / **-n-H-*, so common in Tocharian. Thus, the present VI B *wālānā-* (W 14 b2 *walanalle* ‘a covering, cover’) could be seen as the morphological continuant of the Indo-European nasal present **u₁lHn(e)u-*. The full grade (as if *o*-grade) root of this Tocharian present was created on the analogy of the subjunctive V stem **wālā-*, which continues an Indo-European active perfect **ue-uolHu-*. One may envisage a development of this perfect to a Tocharian **w’āwā₁lāw-ā-* and further on to **w’āwā₁lā-* (through contraction) > B **wālā-* (loss of reduplication as described above), or one might assume that the perfect stem **ue-uolHu-* was reduced to **ue-uol-* in Indo-European in preconsonantal position à la Rasmussen 1989: 84 (perhaps under the influence of such a reduction in the accompanying root aorist). In either case, the resulting form would be Common Toch. **wālā-*, which, as indicated above, impressed its radical vocalism upon the present stem. That is to say, the original I.-E. paradigm: pres. **u₁lH-n(e)u-* ~ perf. (act.) **ue-uolHu-*, (med.) **ue-u₁lHu-* (~ aor. [act.] **uelHu-* / [med.] **u₁lHu-*), resulted in Proto-Tocharian pres. **wālā-n(‘ā)w-*, replaced by **wālā-nā-*, subj. (act.) **w’ā-wā₁lāw-* → **w’ā-wā₁lāw-ā-* > **w’ā-wā₁lā-*, subj. (med.) **w’ā-wlā₁w-ā-* (pret. [act.] **w’ālā₁w-ā-* / [med.] **wlāw-ā-*). Thereupon, on the one hand, in the specialized meaning (‘to

³⁰ Traces of such a formation may be seen in subjunctives of class I of the type A *klinā-*, B *kl(y)inā-*, to *klin-* ‘to be obliged to’, A *sinā-* as in the privative *asināt* ‘unsatisfied’, etc., whose present stems reflect extensions of that stem, cf. the discussion in Hilmarsson 1991c.

contain, be contained') and based on the root structure of the perfect (→ Tocharian subjunctive) middle **w'äwłāwā-* > **włāwā-*, and, possibly, the aorist (→ Tocharian preterite) middle **włāwā́-*, a new paradigm emerged: pres. IV **włāwā́* (unattested but likely), subj. V **włāwā-*, pret. Ibß **włāwā́-*, past ptc. **wæwłāwā́-* → **wāwłāwā-*. And, on the other hand, in the meaning 'to cover' and based on the root structure of the perfect (→ Tocharian subjunctive) active **w'äwæłāwā-* > **wæłā-*, a separate paradigm was created: pres. VI **wæł(ä)nā́-* > **wālānā-*, subj. V **wæłā-* (> B *wālā-*, but A unattested), pret. Ibß **wæłā́-* > **wālā́-*, past ptc. **wæwæłā́-* > **wæwālā́-* → **wāwālā́-*.

§7.2.10. B *ayātatte** 'untamed' is presumably formed to the causative rather than to the non-causative of the verb B *yāt-* 'to be able, capable'; see the discussion of this privative in §8.4.4.

§7.3. To sum: This first group of privatives could in theory all be derived from the subjunctive stem, the preterite stem or the past participle. However, if Marggraf's rules of accentuation are correct and if these rules do correlate with the loss or retention of the nasal of the privatives, then the choice is limited, for these privatives can then be derived only from the subjunctive stem or be of one origin with that stem. I shall leave aside for the time being the question whether the privatives can be derived from the stem of the past participles. Indeed, the past participle does not constitute a *forme de fondation* in Tocharian except in the case of the formation of the absolutes (e.g. *śesüwer* to *śesü*) and then the derivatives retain the reduplication syllable. Clearly the privatives do not bear such a relationship to the past participles. On the other hand, it is well possible that the privatives share a common origin with the past participles.

Privatives in Common Tocharian *-ättæ* Group Ib

§8. Group Ib contains privatives in B **-ätte* formed to the causatives of their respective verbs. These causatives are classified by Krause (1952) as forming presents of class IXb α , subjunctives of the same class, preterites of class II, and reduplicated past participles (thus *spārtt-* 'to turn' intrans. [caus. 'to turn' trans.], *wātk-* 'to divide, decide' [caus. 'to order'] *wik-* 'to disappear' [caus. 'to remove'], and presumably *trik-* 'to be confused' [caus. 'to confuse']); a variation of this pattern, with a secondarily generalized *-šš-* / *-sk-* suffix in the preterite and the past participle, is classified by Krause as a causative present IXb β , with subjunctive of the same class, preterite IV and a reduplicated past participle (thus *yāt-* 'to be able, capable' [caus. 'to gain control over, to tame']). To three of these five verbs causative presents of class VIII are attested beside the presents of class IX (*trik-*, *yāt-*, *wik-*).

Group Ib

privative	pres.	subj.	pret.	past ptc.
<i>aikatte*</i>	<i>wikāššä-</i>	<i>wikāššä-</i>	<i>yáikā-</i>	<i>yaiku</i>
<i>aitkatte*</i>	<i>wātkāššä-</i>	<i>wātkāššä-</i>	<i>yātkā-</i>	<i>yaitku</i>
<i>atraikatte*</i>	unattested	unattested	<i>tráikā-</i>	<i>tetriku</i>
<i>ayātatte*</i>	<i>yātāššä</i> ³¹	<i>yātāššä-</i>	<i>yātāššā-</i>	<i>yayātāššu</i>

³¹ Found only in MQ texts, but the accent was certainly on the initial syllable. The form B *yātsām* of 201 M a3, classed as present IXb β by Krause 1952: 271, is most probably of class VIIIb, as argued by K. T. Schmidt 1969: 26, n.3, for the text is prose and syncope would therefore be unexpected.

*ešpirtatte** *spārttāššä*⁻³² *spārttāššä-* *špyārttā*⁻³³ *pešpirttu*

§8.1. It is immediately clear that these privatives cannot have been formed to any of their accompanying verbal stems as shown here. The present and subjunctive suffix *-äššä-* does not appear in the privative, and the preterite stems all have *ā*-vocalisms (i.e. *-ā-* or *-ai-* < **-āi-*) which would only fit *atraikatte** (and *ayātatte**, but here the preterite is of class IV in *-äššā-*), but not the other privatives. The past participles have root vocalisms that would match the privatives (except *tetrikū*), but their reduplication syllable is not found in the privatives, which makes a derivation of the latter from the past participles unlikely. That is to say, none of the stems is a viable candidate as a *forme de fondation* of these privatives.

§8.1.1. However, it is likely that causative subjunctives of class IX in *-äššä-* have replaced an earlier and quite different formation. Vestiges of this formation can be found among the West Tocharian causative imperatives.

Before addressing that question, a few words are needed concerning the formation of the imperatives in general. According to Krause 1952: 148 the stem formation of the imperative harmonizes partly with that of the subjunctive and partly with that of the preterite. Krause & Thomas 1960: 234 state that the imperative mostly follows the preterite in formation, less often the subjunctive; similarly Van Windekens 1982: 237, Jasanoff 1987: 92sq; cf. furthermore, Marggraf 1970: 31-37.

This is not the place to analyse in depth the details of the

³² The present of this causative is attested twice with and twice without initial palatalization. Suffixal *-äššä-* is assumed here, but all attested forms have *-aššä-* as if from underlying **-āššä-*, cf. again the discussion in §8.4.5.

³³ The form actually attested is 30 Š b3 (3sg.) *špyārta*.

imperative formations. In short it may be stated that a connection with the subjunctive stem rather than with the preterite stem is unmistakable in imperative classes I, II, IV, and V while a connection with the preterite stem is clear in the case of class III and isolated instances of class I imperatives, while class VI imperatives are a mixed lot, a residuum of strange forms. Furthermore, as suggested below, it seems likely that the causative class II imperatives, derived as they are from a subjunctive stem, may ultimately derive from non-causative preterites of class I.

§8.1.2. The handbooks divide the imperatives into six classes (Krause 1952: 147–153, Krause & Thomas 1960: 234–237). Of 28³⁴ class I imperative stems³⁵ listed by Krause, 22 are clearly derived from class V subjunctives.³⁶ Of the remaining six, *pāklyauš* ‘listen!’ is formed to the subjunctive II *klyaušā*-³⁷ and (2pl. act.) *pśaiso* ‘live!’³⁸ is formed to the subjunctive II *sāyā*-. The radical vocalism of *pātsilpar-ñ* ‘make me free!’ indicates a palatalizing underlying *-ä*-; therefore, a connection with the zero grade subjunctive V *tsālpā*- is unlikely, and this imperative should rather be defined as a causative imperative of class II (cf. below). There are also reasons to believe that *pāsa*, *pasāt* ‘bring!’ are causatives (i.e., ‘let bring!’) rather than non-causatives. At least they do not fit the non-causative subjunctive II stem *āšā*- nor the thereby implied (though

³⁴ Or rather 29, counting the imperative *psaina* mentioned by Krause 1952: 150 n. This form is discussed below.

³⁵ Described as suffixless by Krause (*l.c.*) and Krause & Thomas (*l.c.*), but the stem-final *-ā*- must surely be seen as suffixal and not as an ending. The same applies to the class II causative imperatives.

³⁶ Two of these, *prutkar* ‘encircle!’ and *pātrīwa-ne* ‘blend it!’, due to their causative meaning, might actually have to be seen as class II imperatives.

³⁷ That is, synchronically this subjunctive is the base from which the imperative is drawn. It does not necessarily follow that Jasanoff’s analysis (1987: 94sq.) of this imperative is thereby contested.

³⁸ The form *pśāya*, listed by Krause 1952: 150, is not attested. The text in question (404 § b1) has *pśā[y]* /// that could stand for *pśāyā**.

unattested) preterite **āṣā-*. These forms might then be seen as of class II (cf. below). Only *pättāsat* 'place!', *pāṣṣat* 'guard!', appear to be affiliated with their respective preterite stems.

§8.1.3. Imperatives of class II are fewer in number, possibly 12. They are characterized by initial palatalization, radical *-ā*-vocalism, and suffixal *-ā-*, except the two non-ablauting *ā*-verbs (*ās-* and *sain-*) that retain their radical *ā*-vocalism and do not palatalize. Unfortunately, the original accentuation of class II imperatives – as that of most (probably all) imperative stems – is not ascertainable. The imperative prefix³⁹ added a whole new initial syllable to the stem, apparently at a time preceding the fixation of the accent on the second syllable of forms of more than two syllables⁴⁰.

The imperatives of class II are causative in meaning. Krause 1952: 150 and Krause & Thomas 1960: 235 maintain that these imperatives are closely associated with the causative preterite II. However, the fact that both formations show initial palatalization does not necessarily imply a close relationship, for there is a striking difference in their radical vocalism: the preterite II has a radical palatalizing *-ā-* whereas the imperative II has a radical *-ā-* (beside the two verbs with a non-palatalizing radical *-ā-*). This contrast is quite clear in B imp. *pika* 'remove!' < **pā-w'ākā-* but pret. *yaikā-* < **w'āikā-*, imp. *pitka* 'order!' < **pā-w'ātkā-* but pret. *yātkā-* < **w'ātkā-*, or *pīta* 'adorn!'⁴¹ < **pā-yātā-* but pret. *yātā-*. In the same fashion the imperatives *pīrat* 'cleanse!' < **pā-w'ārā-*, *pāścama* 'stand!' (trans.) < **pā-ścāmā-*, and

³⁹ In all probability, imperatives that do not exhibit the imperative prefix have disposed of it late, i.e., after the fixation of the accent (but note B 331 S a5 *lāmās* as against 46 S b4 *plamas-ñ*. For an excellent account of the dialectal distribution of the imperative prefix and its absence within West Tocharian, see Ringe 1989a.

⁴⁰ Only verbs in initial vowel would be able to reveal their original accentuation, cf. B imperative 2sg. act. (91 S a3) *pāsa*, 2pl. mid. (331 S b4) *pasāt* to *ās-* 'to bring'.

⁴¹ Found in text 94 S b2; not listed in the handbooks.

päccapa 'let declare!' < **pä-cäpā*⁴² differ from their unattested but inferable preterites **yārā-* (or **yairā-*?), **ścāmā-*, **cāpā*⁴³, resp. Note furthermore 283 MQR a3 *pätsilpar-n läk lentamem* 'release me from pains!'⁴⁴ < **pä-tsälpā*⁴⁵ but pret. II *tsyälpā-*. Only the imperative *śālāt* '(let) bring!' (an MQ form; for expected **śalat* < **śālāt*) has a form that is compatible with the accompanying preterite II (*śālamai*). In view of the seven clear instances of imperatives II with a palatalizing -ä-vocalism as against the single *śālāt* with a palatalizing -ā-, I am inclined to regard this latter form as secondary. It is conceivable one has here the influence of the preterite II, but that is rather unlikely, because nowhere else in the imperative system is any relationship with that preterite formation to be seen. Even causative imperatives of class IV with a generalized -šš- suffix do not match the accompanying preterite II forms in their vocalism, e.g. *kātkāšsar* 'let transgress!' but pret. II *śātkatai*, *maskāšsar* 'let be!' but pret. II *myāskawa*, etc. There are three alternatives, then. The first is to regard *śālāt* as a scribal mistake for **śālāt* or **śalāt*. Such things occur, but cannot be proved or disproved. The second, is to regard *śālāt* as influenced by the non-causative imperatives of class I, such as *pwāyar-me* 'let them be led!', *plāma* 'sit!', etc., even if the latter do not have initial palatalization. Such influence would have produced an active imperative **śālā-*, while in the middle a zero grade would have been expected as this verb is an ablauting one, cf. the non-causative imperatives (act.) *pkāla* vis-à-vis (med.) *pkalar*. A

⁴² This form occurs in a Šorčuq-text and is plainly to be reconstructed thus. The gemination after the imperative prefix is a secondary phenomenon and must not have anything to do with an original consonant cluster, cf. B *tättā-* 'to place'.

⁴³ A preterite IV *tapāšša* is attested once (405 M b7), but such preterites are clearly secondarily formed due to a late spread of the causative suffix.

⁴⁴ Possibly also in 267 Š b1 (*pätsi*)*lpar nīś läklemem*.

⁴⁵ Beside the causative imperative IV 108 S a9 *tsalpāšsar-me*.

middle form on the non-causative pattern would have been identical with the pre-existing causative form, i.e. *śālā-. Is it possible that the active vocalism was simply generalized in the middle as well? The third alternative is to deny the traditional interpretation of śālāt as an imperative form. It occurs in a somewhat broken context, and the only reason for judging it an imperative form is the occurrence of the imperative pāt[ta]s[a]t 'place!' in the same line⁴⁶. – Beside the possible membership of the imperatives pātrīwa-ne 'blend it!' and prutkar 'encircle!' in class II, there remain two imperatives that probably have to be seen as belonging to that class. One is formed to the verb ās- 'to bring', i.e., 2sg. act pāsa, and 2pl. med. pasāt; as seen above this imperative does not fit into the non-causative paradigm of the verb ās-, but it could be seen as a causative formation on a par with pika etc, with the modification that the radical non-ablauting ā-vocalism is retained. The second is psaina to the verb sain- 'to lean on, be reliant on'. As I have endeavoured to show in a recent paper (due to appear in the Festschrift for Prof. Ji Xianlin, Peking) this imperative is a causative of class II.⁴⁷

§8.1.4. Other imperative classes are of less concern to us here. Class III is clearly formed to preterites of class III, while classes IV and V appear to be late formations to (present /) subjunctive classes IX and XII resp. Class VI contains a residuum of forms that relate partly to present, partly to subjunctive, and partly to preterite stems.

§8.2. From the discussion in §8.1.3 it appears clear that the

⁴⁶ The line runs as follows: 575 MQ a6-7 : śak yāknesa yo(lomeṇ) – – (p?)śālāt teyknesa : tontsa t[a]ne ke /// (lacuna of some 16 syllables) /// (ṣaṇ) yāmornta pāt[ta]s[a]t :

⁴⁷ It is attested in the bilingual psain[a] kl(autsai) translating Skt. avadhatsva śrotraṇ, and virtually means 'lean the ear!', i.e. 'listen closely'.

causative imperatives of class II cannot be associated with the causative preterites of class II. The imperatives II have a stem final $-\bar{a}-$, which brings to mind the non-causative imperatives of class I. An overwhelming majority of these are formed to subjunctives of class V in final $-\bar{a}-$.

On this background, it may be suggested that the causative imperatives of class II are formed to an earlier existing causative subjunctive of class V that has later been totally replaced by a class IX formation as the causative marker $-\$\$-$ / $-sk-$ gained in distribution. The spread of this marker was demonstrably an on-going process in the Tocharian causative: while the present and the subjunctive always have this marker (though far less common, there are, of course, also class VIII $[-s-]$, X $[-nVsk-]$, and XI $[-sVsk-]$, causatives), it has only partly gained ground in the preterite, past participle, and in the imperative.

It has been argued or implied at various points in the preceding text that the subjunctive V reflects an Indo-European perfect or a category that would correspond to the Indo-European perfect (and/or related formations [statives?]). As far as the vocalism of the non-causative subjunctive V is concerned, there is, of course, no problem with this. On the other hand, should the assumption be correct that the causative imperatives of the type *pitka* 'order!' reflect the previous existence of a causative subjunctive V $*w'atkā-$, the implied $e-$ [i.e. Tocharian \bar{a} -]vocalism of that formation would at first seem unexpected. There may be a reasonable explanation to this, however.

It is well-known that causatives of class IX sometimes exhibit initial palatalization. Sieg & Siegling & Schulze 1931: 398 pointed out that there appears to be a relationship between the radical vocalism

– and, consequently, the presence or absence of palatalization – of the preterite of the basic (non-causative) verb and that of the present and subjunctive of the corresponding causative verb.⁴⁸ That is to say, the palatalized causative subjunctive V, implied by the imperatives in question, must not be seen as identical with the non-causative subjunctive V in origin (or formation). While the non-causative subjunctive V may be associated with an Indo-European perfect or perfect-related formation, the palatalized causative subjunctive V may ultimately have to be associated with the non-causative palatalized preterite I, which in turn reflects an Indo-European root aorist.

§8.3. It is evident that the five privatives of Group Ib are formed to the same causative stem as the imperatives of class II. This is also confirmed by such pairs as privative *aikatte** and imperative *pika*, or privative *aitkatte* and imperative *pitka*. This causative stem cannot have been the causative preterite stem, which would not match the vocalism of neither the privatives nor the imperatives; it is therefore suggested here that this stem must have been the original causative subjunctive stem (probably ultimately deriving from the non-causative preterite I stem), later replaced by a subjunctive IX stem. A subjunctive stem is definitely what one would expect as the basis of privatives.

§8.4. We can now move on to a discussion of the five privatives formed to causative subjunctives.

§8.4.1. B *aikatte** ‘not removing’ is a *hapax legomenon* attested

⁴⁸ This observation was further developed by Winter 1980a: 553sq., who showed that verbs with initial palatalization in the preterite (and, consequently, the causative present) form their non-causative presents with a nasal infix. While Winter warned against seeking an explanation of this palatalization phenomenon in terms of immediate Indo-European preforms, preferring to judge palatalization here as a “semantisch-syntaktische Selektionseigenschaft”, utilized as a marker of transitivity in Tocharian, I have suggested (Hilmarsson 1990[91]: 104sq.) that the pattern nasal present vs. palatalized preterite was an archaic feature reflecting an Indo-European nasal present vs. e-grade root aorist.

in H 149. 45 b4 *te aikaccepi kleśanma*, translated by Broomhead 1962a: 196 with "That [is (the characteristic)] of one who is unable to destroy the kleśas". Though the text in question is most probably an MQ-text⁴⁹ there is no reason to assume that the suffixal *-a-* should reflect **-ā-* rather than **-ā-*; there is no place in the one basic or the two causative paradigms of the verb *wik-* 'to disappear' to accommodate this privative other than alongside the causative imperative *pika*, i.e. both derive from a causative subjunctive V **yikā-* < **w'ikā-*. The privative *aikatte** reflects earlier **éikātte* < **eyikātte* from Common Toch. **æn-w'ikāttæ*⁵⁰ with regular loss of the prefixal nasal before a consonant (other than *p* or *k*).

§8.4.2. B *aikatte** 'uncommissioned, not ordered'⁵¹ is found at 521 Š a4 in the form *aikā(tte)*, where its sense is ascertained by the known Sanskrit original, and in the identical but very fragmentary text Lévi K 4 a5 *ai(tkatte)*, cf. Sieg 1938: 17. A derived abstract is 293 Š a1 *[ai]tk[a]tñe* in an inscrutable context. B *aikatte** is clearly formed to causative subjunctive V stem B **yātkā-*, and thus derives through B **éitkātte* < **eyitkātte* from Common Toch. **æn-w'ātkāttæ*, cf. B *aikatte**.

§8.4.3. B *atraikatte** 'unfailing, not misleading'⁵². Probably to be translated so in its only occurrence 405 M a2 *saim wāste=traikatte ptantse ašām star* 'worthy is the shelter [and] unfailing refuge of the Stūpa'. The unaccented *-ā-* of *saim wāste* indicates a compound with regular accentuation on the (last syllable of the) first member; in a

⁴⁹ As seen by instances of *ma* for *mā*, *pālsko* for *pālsko*, etc.

⁵⁰ The original accent of this privative cannot be definitely determined. However, to judge by the other causative privatives, i.e. *aikatte*, etc. that clearly accent the initial vocalism, it seems likely that the underlying subjunctive stem accented the radical and not the suffixal vocalism.

⁵¹ Krause 1952: 288 "unbeauftragt", Broomhead 1962b: 292 "unbidden".

⁵² Krause 1952: 42 has "unverwirrbar".

simplex one would have expected *waste*. The congruence of the privative is therefore in the nominative singular. In *sandhi* final *-e* and initial *a-* are usually contracted to yield *-a-* (and so *-e* and *ā-* yield *-ā-*), but the outcome *-e-* as here is not uncommon either. There is therefore no reason to assume a form *etraikatte**, because *atraikatte**, as posited in the handbooks, with *ā*-umlaut of the radical as well as of the prefixal vocalism, would be a quite expected form. The ultimate cause of the chain-reaction of *ā*-umlauts is, of course, the suffixal *-ā-*.

The radical vocalism of *atraikatte** is unexpected. The verb *trik-* 'to be confused, etc.' is not an *ā*-verb⁵³ as shown by the membership of its basic present forms in class III, not class IV. The radical form *traik-* is found – as to be expected – in the causative preterites III *traiksa* and II *traika*, both of which probably reflect (as if) Indo-European *ēi*-vocalisms (or *-oi-*), with *ā*-umlaut (at least) in the latter instance, – and in the substantive *traike* 'confusion', presumably with an *oi*-vocalism. All other forms of this relatively common verb have a radical *trik-*, except the privative *atraikatte**. The verb *trik-* forms a basic verb of present class III (3sg. *triketär*) and subjunctive class V (abstract *trikalyñe*, an MQ-form of unascertainable accentuation). Its meaning is intransitive: 'to be confused'. Even though Krause 1952: 250 classes the privative *atraikatte** with this basic verb, this is surely excluded on semantic grounds. Besides, privatives are regularly formed to the lower grade of an ablauting subjunctive, so that *atraikatte** would be quite exceptional beside the abstract *trikalyñe*.

Beside the basic verb, *trik-* forms two causative paradigms. The

⁵³ By *ā*-verb is meant a verb that either has an original Tocharian radical *ā*-vocalism (i.e. reflecting an Indo-European *-a-*, (*-ā-* ?), *-ō-*, or a laryngeal) or has generalized an umlauted *ā*-vocalism in its entire paradigm. Such verbs typically form presents of class IV in Tocharian.

one has a present VIII and subjunctive II (3sg. *triśām*). Clearly, a privative to this stem would have had the form **etrisätte*⁵⁴. The other has no attested present or subjunctive forms, but the preterite is of class II (3sg. *traika-ne*) and there is a past participle *tetrikū*. Expected would be a present and subjunctive of class IX. Semantically, our *atraikatte** fits best as a causative. If the conclusions reached in §8.1sq. are correct, and the subjunctive IX has replaced an earlier subjunctive of class V, one might have expected here a privative in final **-ätte*. The vocalism of this subjunctive would have been a palatalizing (I.-E.) *ei*-grade > (Toch.) *i*-grade. That is, B **ecrikatte* would have been the expected form⁵⁵ to the (earlier) subjunctive **crikā-*. The preterite II of the same paradigm had the form **crāikā-*. It might perhaps be suggested that when **cr-* was replaced by *tr-* in these forms, the vocalism of the preterite influenced that of the subjunctive stem: i.e., as **crāikā-* became *trāikā-*, so **crikā-* became **trāikā-* instead of the expected **trikā-* which would have been identical with the non-causative subjunctive stem. It must not be denied though that one might perhaps have expected a similar generalization of the *-āi-* in the past participle when **cecrikū* was replaced by *tetrikū*.

§8.4.4. B *ayātatte** is attested six times. It is glossed with “nicht zu bändigen” by Krause 1952: 42, and with “insurmontable” by Van Windekens 1979: 95. Broomhead 1962b: 184 has “unsubdued” which is probably more exact. I suggest ‘unsubdued, untamed’ as would fit well in H 149. 15 b4 *[la]ñke slakareṃ cem palsko āyātaicce kartseś* that could be

⁵⁴ In such a paradigmatic pattern, subjunctives of class I are frequently found beside subjunctives of class II. Theoretically, a privative **etrikätte* would therefore be a possibility. However, *atraikatte** with suffixal **-ā-* is too far removed from a putative **etrikätte* formally to be considered its replacement.

⁵⁵ Judging by East Tocharian, a front vowel caused palatalization of a preceding *tr-*; this palatalization appears to have been eliminated in West Tocharian, cf. A *caccrīku* vs. B *tetrikū* ‘confused’, etc.

rendered with 'this light dejected/volatile(?)⁵⁶ spirit (obl. sg.), unsubdued for (the purpose of) good'. Here "unsubdued" or "untamed" seems better than "indomitable". Such a meaning would also fit in 213 MQR a3 (po)yśīññeṣṣu yatāṣṣeñcai ayātaiyccem 'O, all-knowing tamer of the untamed (spirits)!'.⁵⁷ The use of the causative of the verb B *yāt-* (A *yāt-*) with the oblique of B *palsko* 'thought, spirit' (also with such words as *indri* 'sense' [and *yakwe* 'horse', metaphorically used for *indri*]) in the meaning 'to tame the spirit' ('senses', 'horses') is common, and makes it extremely likely that the privative *ayātatte**, used with *palsko* in most (possibly all) its attested instances derives from the causative of the verb *yāt-* rather than from the non-causative⁵⁸. To be sure, on purely formal grounds, one might consider a derivation from the non-causative subjunctive V *yātā-*, and that might fit semantically as well, if one translates *ayātatte** with 'incapable, unable' (to the non-causative *yāt-* 'to be able, capable') instead of with 'untamed'. Still, because of the collocation with *palsko* the causative alternative seems preferable. Whether causative or non-causative, *ayātatte** would derive from a subjunctive V: on the one hand, there is the non-causative subjunctive V 3sg. *yātaṃ* (e.g. 41 Š a6); on the other hand, since the radical *ā*-vocalism

⁵⁶ The adjective B *slakkare*, *slakare*, A *slākkār*, is glossed by Thomas & Krause 1964: 158, 260 with "schlaff, niedergeschlagen, traurig", but Thomas 1974: 88 (cf. also Thomas 1983: 155, 1984: 22, 121) shows that at least in one context (TX 3 a1) B (*sla*)*kk(a)r(e)* translates Skt. *capala-* "sich hin und her bewegend, beweglich, schwankend, rasch bei der Hand, flüchtig" and as an adverb "schnell, rasch". Such a translation is adopted by Van Windekens 1976: 430.

⁵⁷ Cf., furthermore, PK 17. 8 b4 *ayātaicce palskosa* and PK 17. 11 a3 *palskw ayātaiccu* where surely the "untamed spirit" is meant, although I have not had occasion to verify these two examples (see Broomhead 1962b: 23); neither do I know the context of PK 12 J b5 as referred by Krause 1952: 271. Cf. also Lévi S 7 a2 *ayātai(cce) oṅkipṣe yūkoymā palsko* 'would that I overcome the unsubdued shameless spirit', as based on the reading of Broomhead 1962b: 156.

⁵⁸ Krause 1952: 271 classes *ayātaitte* (i.e. our *ayātatte**, cf. below) as a non-causative.

is inherent, a causative subjunctive **yātā-* would be on a par with the causative subjunctive V stems B **yikā-*, **yitkā-*, etc.

A somewhat different view of the formation of this privative might be taken. It has been convincingly shown by K. T. Schmidt (1969: 26 n.3) that beside the non-causative paradigm of the verb *yāt-* there was not only one causative with a present and subjunctive IX and a preterite of class IV, as posited by the handbooks, but two causative paradigms, the second one having a present VIII, found in 201 M a3 (3sg.) *yātšām*⁵⁹, and a preterite of class III, found in the form 365 MQR b6 (1sg.) *yā[t]wa*. A subjunctive in such a paradigm would characteristically be a thematic one of class II, but there are frequent instances of athematic class I subjunctives as well, cf. Krause 1952: 79–82 for the material; note that Krause's statement that only the verb B *tsuk-* 'to (make) drink' forms a subjunctive I in this pattern is wrong. To the attested present VIII *yātšām* and the preterite III *yātwa* one might therefore expect a subjunctive II or I. Clearly, our privative, which in all its attested instances has a radical *-t-*, cannot be formed to a subjunctive II, but a subjunctive I (**yātā-*) would be formally possible. The question is how to interpret the suffixal vocalism *-ai-*. K. T. Schmidt 1986: 638 has noted that B *a* from *ä* sporadically appears as *ai* before a palatal sound, which he ascribes to language usage at a lower level ("Umgangssprache") than standard written texts ("Hochsprache"). All the instances of the privative under discussion here have the palatal sequence *-cc-* following the suffixal vowel, and one might therefore draw the conclusion that we here have one more instance of a change of B *-a-* (< **-ä-*) to *-ai-* before a palatal. This may indeed be the explanation of the form *ayātaicc-*.

⁵⁹ The text is prose, and – as noted by K. T. Schmidt *l.c.* – the form *yātšām* cannot be a shortened version of **yātāššām*.

However, there are other instances where B *-a-* from unaccented **-ā-* seems to have changed to *-ai-* under the same conditions, cf. e.g. 231 M a4 *empalkaicci* to *pālkā-* or 26 Š b5 *eṅkalpaiccets* to *kālpā-*, etc., for which there is no etymological reason to posit an underlying suffixal *-ā-* but one must of necessity posit an unaccented *-ā-* (cf. §9.1.3 and §9.2.2 resp.). One might therefore wonder whether Schmidt's observation is not valid for West Tocharian *-a-* in general without regard to its origins, **-ā-* or **-ā-*. That is to say, the privative *ayātaicc-* could theoretically reflect either **āyātācc-* or **āyātācc-*. In the first instance it would derive from a causative subjunctive I **yātā-* (and therefore belong with the privatives discussed in §11 below), while in the second instance it would derive from a subjunctive V *yātā-*, which, if non-causative – and that possibility has been declined here – would belong with the privatives discussed above in §7sq., or if causative – as it probably was – would belong with the privatives discussed in §8sq. – It goes without saying that the initial *ā-* has suffered *ā*-umlaut through the following radical *-ā-*.

§8.4.5. B *eṣpirtatte** 'unturned (i.e. not made to rotate)' is attested twice. Semantically, it is clearly transitive, cf. 30 Š b7 *pelaikneṣṣe yerkwantai taiknesa eṣpirtacce nauṣ pudñākte eṅklyauṣacce sparttaṣṣām mā=llek tu campām* 'In this manner the Buddha turns the previously unturned [and] unheard Wheel of the Law; no-one else can do that' (cf. Sieg & Siegling 1949: 51)⁶⁰. This privative should therefore be associated with the causative stem of the verb listed in the handbooks as *spārtt-* 'to turn', not with the non-causative as suggested by Krause 1952: 302. In its non-causative paradigm, *spārtt-* has a constant *ā*-vocalism and

⁶⁰ Similarly, Amb. a2 *pelaikneṣṣe laukaññe=ṣpirtacce sparttaṣṣām cakkā(r)* 'He would turn the long unturned wheel of the Law' (cf. Lévi 1912: 164).

forms a present of class IV⁶¹ as is typical of *ā*-verbs (cf. §8.4.3 with footnote 53 for a definition of *ā*-verbs). Formally, therefore, and not only semantically, the privative *ešpirtatte** would be anomalous in the non-causative paradigm. In the causative paradigm, on the other hand, the past participle *pešpirttu* has a root syllable identical with that of *ešpirtatte**, indicating an earlier **šp'ärt(t)-*. That root form might also be seen in the causative present IX (30 Š b8) *šparttaššäm*, or imperfect/optative (Amb. a2) *špartaššim* beside the more common forms with generalized *spärt(t)-* (e.g. present [200 M b1] *spārtaššäm*, or infinitive [Lévi S 4 a2] *spärtassi*, etc.). There is therefore good formal reason to class *ešpirtatte** as a causative formation. It is assumed here that it is formed to a previous causative subjunctive V **šp'ärt(t)ā-* on a par with *aitkatte** to **yitkā-*, or *aikatte** to **yikā-*, etc. as discussed in the preceding paragraphs.

Privatives in Common Tocharian *-āttæ* Group Ic

§9. In Group Ic we are confronted with further non-causative privatives in **-ätte*. Unlike the privatives of Group Ia that were formed to verbs with preterites of class Ibβ and reduplicated past participles, the privatives of Group Ic are formed to verbs that have preterites of class Iaβ and past participles with no reduplication. Both groups, however, have or had subjunctives of class V. Note that when the subjunctives are

⁶¹ A proviso must, of course, be made here for the fact that in West Tocharian present class IV has radical *o*-vocalism (in A *-a-*) whose relationship to the root's *ā*-vocalism has not been sufficiently cleared yet. It is generally assumed, however, that this *-o-* somehow reflects an underlying (umlauted) *-ā-*.

apophonic, the radical vocalism of the privatives regularly agrees with the zero grade vocalism of the subjunctives.

Group Ic privative	pres.	subj.	pret.	past ptc.
<i>ekatkatte*</i>	<i>kātkānā</i> - VI <i>kāttānkā</i> - VII	<i>kātkā</i> - V <i>kātkā́</i> - V <i>kātkā</i> - V	<i>sātkā́</i> - Iaß	<i>kātkau</i>
<i>ekwalatte*</i>	<i>kwālé</i> - III	<i>kwālā́</i> - V	<i>kwālā́</i> -	unattested
<i>empalkatte*</i>	suppletive	<i>pālkā</i> - V <i>pālkā</i> - V	<i>pālkā́</i> - Iaß	<i>pālkau</i>
<i>enkarstatte*</i>	<i>kārsnā́</i> - VI	<i>krāstā</i> -* V <i>kārstā</i> - V	<i>kārstā́</i> - Iaß	<i>kārstau</i>

§9.1 The loss or retention of the prefixal nasal of the privatives of Group Ic do not, at first sight, appear to bear any relation to Marggraf's accent rules as described above. The material seems contradictory. An analysis of each of these privatives reveals, however, that they can be accommodated within the system.

§9.1.1. First, *ekatkatte** 'not crossing, not passing' is not problematic. This privative is attested only once: PK 12 C b1-2 *(sa)[m](u)d(tā)rntse totteññe ekātkātte se mā srukalñe yānmālle*, translated by Couvreur 1954: 82: 'Ohne die Grenze des ... Ozeans zu Überschreiten, wird dieser den Tod nicht erreichen'. It is quite clear that *ekātkātte* has a transitive sense here. The subjunctive V to the verb *kātk*- 'to cross, pass', i.e. *kātkā*- / *kātkā́*-, is attested with initial as well as with suffixal accent. Initial accent is found in 355 M b4 *kerekauna k(a)tkatsi* 'to cross the stream' and 608 M a2 *taññe yaitkor katka[t](s)i* 'to pass over your command'. In both instances the initial accent fits the clearly

transitive meaning. A further instance of initial accent is found in 539 D a3 *katk[a]lyi*, but the exact meaning cannot be gathered from the extremely fragmentary text. Suffixal accentuation is found in 11 Š a4 *laute mā kätkoytär-me* 'the (right) moment should not be passed by you'. Here the verb clearly conveys a passive meaning, and the accentuation confirms Marggraf's findings. Furthermore, the form *kätkālñemem* of 418 M a2 occurs in a broken context that does not yield to an interpretation.

That is to say, the subjunctive V (*kätkā-*⁶² /) *kätkā-* has initial accentuation when used transitively. The privative *ekatkatte** is transitive in meaning; therefore, it must be assumed that it derives from the transitive subjunctive *kätkā-*, whereby the loss of the prefixal nasal can be seen as regular.

§9.1.2. Second, there is *ekwalatte**. With this privative we encounter severe difficulties. The solution offered here may seem *ad hoc*, but the least that can be said of it is that it offers a viable alternative.

Krause 1952: 43, 243, translates *ekwalatte** with 'unwiderstehlich' and Broomhead 1962b: 49 has 'irresistible'. Krause (*o.c.*, p. 243), hesitatingly, derives *ekwalatte** from the verb *kwäl-* 'schleppen'(?). However, K. T. Schmidt 1983[1985]: 429 and esp. 1984: 152-153 has argued that such a verb does not exist, for its only manifestation, i.e. the alleged 3rd plural subjunctive *kwelem*, is in reality the oblique plural masculine of an adjective *kwele* 'black, dark grey, (Skt.) *kāḍaśyāma*'. A different verbal basis must therefore be found to accommodate *ekwalatte**. Fortunately, that is easy, for a suitable candidate might be seen in the verb B *kul-* (A *kul-*) 'to relax, slacken, abate, recede, wane', which

⁶² Found in Karmavācana-texts, see K. T. Schmidt 1986 s.v.

forms a present III *kūletār* (A *kulatār*), subjunctive V *kūlātār* (A optative *kuli(š)*), preterite Iaβ *kūlā-ne*. In view of the shape of the privative, the root form should be posited as *kwāl-* rather than as *kul-*.

Van Windekens 1976: 240 endorses Lane's association of *kwāl-* (i.e. *kul-*) with Skt. *glāyati*, *glāti* 'to be tired', which is impossible for phonological reasons, for it does not account for the initial *kū-* / *ku-* / *kwā-*. In my opinion, Poucha 1955: 80 has pointed out the correct association, i.e. with Gk. *πέλω*, Skt. *cāratī*, etc., that is, this Tocharian verb would reflect I.-E. **k^ulH-* (for the laryngeal stem, cf. Skt. *cāritum*, *cīṛṇa-*, *cūrti-*). Thus, I.-E. **k^ulH-* would provide the subjunctive stem **kwālā-* (**kwālā-* > B *kūlā-*) and in the present formation a **k^ulH-o-* (or whatever suffixal extension must be posited here) provided the present stem **kwālæ-* > B *kūle-*, A *kula-*.

The reflexes of the root **k^uel(H)-* in the individual Indo-European languages indicate the meaning 'to turn, move about, be around'; it seems within reason to assume that this root may in Tocharian have developed the sense 'to turn, turn back, recede' and from there 'to slacken, abate'. In fact, every single instance of the verb *kwāl-* allows the translation 'to turn, be turned, recede, abate', e.g. B 21 Š b5 *maiyyo kūlātār-me* 'their power will recede', 278 MQ b2 *(ne)mcek nai tremaṣṣana* (= °me°) *aṣāklaṃts kū[l]etār maiy[y]o* 'surely the power of the angry serpents recedes'. In almost all its occurrences in West as well as in East Tocharian this verb is governed by nouns meaning 'power, energy, zeal, thought' (B *maiyyo*, *warkṣäl*, *spelke*, *āk*, *palsko*, A *tsraṣṣune*, *tampe*). Only once do we find it in an altogether different context. This is H add. 149. 101 b3 *mtsiṣṣe kū(l)ā[n]e (y)o(k)* which must be translated 'his hair-colour changed'. This occurrence, in my opinion,

confirms that the basic meaning of our verb was 'to turn' as would fit the connection with I.-E. **k^hel(H)-*.

The privative *ekwalatte** is attested four times. Unfortunately, I have not been able to verify its occurrences in St 1 a1 and PK 7 D b1 (both cited by Broomhead 1962b: 49), but in 239 MQR a1 *ekw[al](a)cc(e) w(ar)kšä(l)ts(a)* as well as in Lévi S 3 a1 *(e)kwalatte tsirauñe* (so read by Krause 1952: 243 for Lévi's *(śa) kwalante*), a translation of *ekwalatte** with 'unrelenting, unabating' seems proper, as would agree with the meaning of the verb *kwäl-* / *kul-*.

There is no denying that this verb is intransitive in meaning and so, evidently, is the privative. This agrees with the medial subjunctive V stem, which as shown by B *kūlātār*, had suffixal accentuation. One might then have expected the nasal of the privative to have been preserved, if that phenomenon was in any way dependent on the accent.

In order to side-step this problem, I can only offer the following solution: While in West Tocharian all attested present and subjunctive forms of the verb *kwäl-* are medial in form (as against the active preterite forms), East Tocharian has — beside a medial present *kulatār* — an active optative *kuli(š)*. For metrical reasons this form is to be posited so (cf. Sieg 1937: 133, K. T. Schmidt 1969: 42), but not *kuli(tār)* (cf. Krause & Thomas 1960: 229). This active optative form might be taken as an indication that — beside the medial subjunctive forms — there were active subjunctive forms as well. Indeed, even though the intransitive verbs of present class III are characteristically accompanied by medial subjunctive V formations with suffixal accentuation, a few are accompanied by active subjunctives of class V with initial accentuation. In at least one instance, the verb *tsäm-* 'to grow; come forth' (and probably also in the verb *sruk-* 'to die', cf.

below), we have an active subjunctive V with initial accent beside a medial one with suffixal accent, viz. (present III *tsmetär*) active subjunctive V *tsāmat* (516 M b4; with initial accentuation, for one would expect ***tsamāt*, if the suffix had carried the accent, cf. *lkāt* 'you will see' — the accentuation of the verbal stem *lkā-* is commented upon by Marggraf 1970: 29, cf. furthermore the discussion in §9.2.2 below) and optative *tsamoy* (492 MQ a1) beside the medial *tsmāntär* (64 Š a8) and optative, e.g., *tsmoyemtär-ne* (605 Š b2). Other instances of active subjunctive V forms to presents of class III are as follows:

tsānk- 'to arise' (present III *tseriketär*) forms subjunctive V, e.g. *tsānka-ne* (169 Š b3; = /*tsānkā-ne*/) with the infinitive *tsānkatsi* (561 Š a2; = /*tsānkātsi*/) and the abstract *tsānkālñe* (193 M a3; = /*tsānkālñe*/);

sruk- 'to die' (present III *sruketär*) forms subjunctive V, e.g. *sraukaṃ* (14 Š b4) with the abstract *srūkālñe* (e.g. 12 Š b4; = /*srūkālñe*/); note that in this verb we may have an interchange of active and medial forms in the optative: *srūko(y)* (46 Š b2) ~ (*sruko*)*yentär* (25 Š a4);

mīt- 'to go' (present III *mitentär*) forms subjunctive V *maitaṃ* (Sieg & Siegling 1949: 151, K. T. Schmidt 1969: 45) with the infinitive *mīta(ts)[y]* (46 Š b8; = /*mītātsi*/).

Two further verbs of the present III ~ subjunctive V pattern show or are assumed to show active subjunctive V forms. The one is B *mānk-* 'to be inferior' with the active subjunctive V *mānkāmo*. However, it is by no means certain that this form is correctly defined so, for it may well be a verbal adjective in *-mo*, cf. K. T. Schmidt 1969: 43, n. 3. The second is B *mārs-* 'to forget' with the active subjunctive V *mārsat* (128 MQR b5) and e.g. the infinitive *mārsatsi* (556 MQ a2). However, Winter 1980: 430 argues that the present III conjugation of this verb in West Tocharian is an innovation (cf. A present VI *mārsneñc*). Thus the verbs

that form presents of class III, accompanied by active subjunctives of class V with initial accent (with or without medial subjunctives with suffixal accentuation), are *tsām-* 'to grow; to come forth', *tsānk-* 'to arise', *sruk-* 'to die', and *mit-* 'to go'. Furthermore, as proposed above, the verb *kwäl-* 'to turn, recede' might be joined to this group, if A *kuli(s)* can be taken as an indication of an active subjunctive formation.

Apart from the fact that all are intransitive, these verbs share another feature: they are all verbs of motion, either synchronically or etymologically. This is clear in the case of *mit-* 'to go' and *tsānk-* 'to arise'; also *tsām-* could be interpreted as a verb of motion ('to come forth, [Germ.] entstehen')⁶³; furthermore, *sruk-* 'to die' probably developed its meaning from an original 'to pass away', and was thus also a verb of motion, cf. OIcel. *strjúka* 'to go away, leave' (cf. Germ. *sich streichen* 'to go away'), Gk. *στυφύεται* 'is drained of strength'; East Toch. *sruk-* 'to kill' does not invalidate this etymology, for this is a causative verb; finally, *kwäl-* 'to turn, recede' can be seen as a verb of motion, as would fit its proposed origin from I.-E. **k^ul(H)-*.

Winter (1980, esp. p. 436-437, also p. 435) points out that there "is an indication that a nonsuppletive verb of motion follows the 'intransitive' pattern ... in the present stem, but the 'transitive' one ... in the non-present forms" and that the reason for such a mixed pattern might be that "the description 'verb of motion' applies only to the nonpresentic forms — they mean 'move toward a state expressed by the present stem'; only with the nonpresentic forms could there originally have been the expression of a goal, a local transitivity ...". It seems

⁶³ Etymologically, this verb, in my opinion, reflects an I.-E. **g^{em}-* 'to come' > Common Toch. **čām-* (or **čām-*) that has suffered depalatalization to *tsām-* under certain morphologically determined conditions (but regular *š-* preserved in some East Tocharian forms). I hope to be able to discuss the development of Indo-European velars in verb-initial position in the near future.

inviting to see the active subjunctive V (and their active preterite) forms of the (middle present class III) verbs of motion in the context of the (local) transitivity of their non-presentic stems. Irrespective of whether these active subjunctive forms are original or whether they are a creation within the history of Tocharian, it is surely expected to have active forms expressing transitivity.

It is in view of this background that I propose that the privative *ekwalatte** was formed to the zero grade of an active subjunctive V stem ***kwālā-* / ***kwālā-* (which, I suggest, existed beside the middle subjunctive V stem *kwālā-*), corresponding to (act.) *tsāmā-* / *tsāmā-* / (mid.) *tsāmā-*, (act.) *tsāñkā-* / *tsāñkā-*, (act.) *srāukā-* / *srūkā-*, (act.) *māitā-* / *mītā-*. Such a privative regularly lost the prefixal nasal in the position before an originally accentuated syllable.

§9.1.3. Third, *empalkatte** and its abstract derivative *empalkatñe** are attested seven times. In most cases the pre-suffixal vocalism is *-ai-* (*empalkaitte* 561 Š a3, Lévi S 8 b4, H 150. 42 a2, and *empalkaicci* 231 M a4), and for that reason the handbooks list this privative as *empalkaitte* (the form *empālkatte* is given in parentheses), cf. e.g. Krause 1952: 43. This *-ai-* is not original, however, and, when occurring in the nominative singular masculine, it must have been introduced on the analogy of oblique forms, where it arose in the position before palatal *-cc-*, cf. the discussion in §8.4.4 above, and also K. T. Schmidt 1986: 638. The expected final *-atte* (< **-ātte*) must be surmised behind the abstract *[e]mpālkatñāñne* (515 MQR a5), and is also confirmed in the otherwise anomalous *empālkatte* (281 MQR b2). In 520 MQR b2 the final is unclear. The form *empālkatte* is clearly an error for either **empalkatte* or **empālkatte* (the text is an MQR-text), for if the radical syllable had been *-pāl-*, it would have caused *ā*-umlaut in the

prefixal syllable. Besides, the text in question, as noted by Sieg & Siegling 1953: 171, has many errors, e.g. a2 *pretse* for *prentse*, a2 *wistsi* for *wiśtsi*, a3 *krentaunaşşen* for *krentauna şşek*, a4 *netsi* for *nestsi*, etc., etc. That is to say, this privative can safely be posited as *empalkatte** as would also agree with the East Tocharian *apālkāt* (cf. §9.1.3.1 below). The form *ampālkatte* (Marggraf 1970: 43) does not exist.

As to the meaning of B *empalkatte**, the handbooks more or less agree in the translation 'unheeding, unconcerned, unworried, (Germ.) unbekümmert', e.g. Krause 1952: 43 (p. 260 'unbesorgt'), Krause & Thomas 1960: 149, 188, etc., cf. also K. T. Schmidt 1969: 316, 323. Once, Thomas (1957: 65) translates with 'rücksichtslos', viz. 231 M a4 *mahūrtstsana āstām tom empalkaicci kārşnoyeñc* 'die diademgeschmückten Häupter schnitten dir die Rücksichtslosen ab'. Cf. furthermore, e.g., Lévi S 8 b4 *empalkaitte tākoym şpā şaul i(nd)r(inta) kektseñān* (emendation, cf. K. T. Schmidt 1969: 323, n. 3) *mā taccimar* 'would that I be unconcerned and would that I take no account of life, senses, and bodies'.

Now, *empalkatte** must derive from a verbal root *pālk-*. There are two alternatives. First, there is the intransitive *pālk-* 'to burn; to be tormented'. This verb forms a present III *pālketār* (8 Š a5), which implies a subjunctive V stem **pālkā-*. That stem could produce a privative *empalkatte** quite regularly with the prefixal nasal retained on account of the suffixal accentuation of the basic **pālkā-*. Semantically, the meaning 'unconcerned, unworried' can be seen as an aspect of 'not burning, untormented'.

The second alternative is less straightforward. It implies deriving *empalkatte** from the verb *pālk-* 'to see'. This verb forms a

subjunctive V *pǎlkā-* / *pǎlkā-*, which in West Tocharian is always active and always has initial accent. If *empalkatte* derives from this stem, the retention of the prefixal nasal runs counter to the theory defended here. However, in East Tocharian, the corresponding subjunctive V is found only in the middle voice. It seems a reasonable assumption that Common Tocharian had medial as well as active forms of this subjunctive, and it is possible that the medial forms were intransitive in meaning. It is difficult to judge, whether the privative *empalkatte** should be interpreted as active / transitive or medial / intransitive. A basic sense 'unheeding' might be seen as transitive, but 'unworried, unconcerned' as intransitive. At any rate, it appears theoretically possible that there was a medial subjunctive V stem **pǎlkā-*, beside the active *pǎlkā-* / *pǎlkā-*, and that stem could have produced the privative *empalkatte** with retained suffixal nasal regularly. The co-existence of active subjunctive V forms with initial accent beside medial or intransitive / passive forms with suffixal accent is not uncommon, cf. §9.1.2.

§9.1.3.1. A corresponding East Tocharian privative *apǎlkāt* is apparently attested in 328 b2, and possibly also in 71 a5, 132 a4. It is formed to a verbal stem corresponding to that of B *empalkatte**. The loss of the prefixal nasal is precisely what one would expect in East Tocharian. The lack of rounding in this form follows a pattern that can be observed in A *apārkār* [B *emparkre*] 'in length, in detail', etc., as against A *opāntāš* [*epiṛkte*] 'inbetween', etc. That is, rounding of the prefixal vocalism takes place before A *-p-* if the corresponding West Tocharian form had no prefixal nasal on the surface, while no rounding of the prefixal vocalism took place before A *-p-* if the corresponding West Tocharian form retained the prefixal nasal. This would indicate that the different reflexes of the prefix in forms like B *emparkre* and

epiŋkte was at the time of the rounding process somehow expressed in East Tocharian as well.

§9.1.4. Fourth, *eŋkarstatte** is attested only once, viz. 136 MQR b5 *eŋkärstātte*, in a fragmentary and inscrutable context. Its precise meaning cannot be gathered, and so it could be interpreted either as an active and transitive 'who does not break' or as a passive and intransitive 'indestructible, who will not be broken'. Attested subjunctive V derivatives of the verb *kärst-* 'to cut off, destroy' show initial accentuation (e.g. the infinitive *karstatsi* 30 Š b3) and their meaning is transitive. However, as with the verbs *kätk-* 'to cross' and *pälk-* 'to see', discussed above (§9.1.1 and §9.1.3 resp.), co-existence of active transitive and passive intransitive subjunctive V stems could be envisaged here. Indeed, the likeliest translation of *eŋkarstatte** would seem to be a passive one, i.e. 'indestructible'. Should this be correct, then this privative could be seen as formed to an intransitive subjunctive V **kärstǎ-*, whose suffixal accentuation would have been responsible for the preservation of the prefixal nasal.

§9.2. In spite of apparent dissimilarity the two following privatives might be taken together as a separate subgroup of Ic:

Group Ic privative	pres.	subj.	pret.	past ptc.
<i>eŋkalpatte*</i>	<i>kälpǎṣṣä-</i> IX	<i>kälpnǎ-</i> VI	<i>kälpǎ-</i> Iaḅ	<i>kälpau</i>
<i>eśuwatte*</i>	<i>śuwǎ-</i> V	<i>śuwǎ-</i> V	<i>śāwǎ-</i> Iaα <i>śuwǎ-</i>	<i>śeśu</i>

§9.2.1. First, let us take *eśuwatte** which is quite straightforward. It is attested only once, viz. H 149. X 5 (= HMR) 3 a4 *tāy no trite kauṃ ṣai eśuwacca mäskītrǎ* 'for her it was now the third day

that she had not eaten'. Clearly, *eśuwatte** 'who has not eaten' must be associated with the verb B *śuwā-* (the handbooks give *śu-* / *śwā-*) 'to eat', and can be derived from the subjunctive stem *śuwā-* without effort.

The accentuation of this subjunctive form has no relevance for the question of the prefixal nasal here, for it would be lost before *-ś-* at all events. However, suffixal accentuation is shown by e.g. the 3rd pl. subjunctive *śwām-ne*, for initial accentuation would have yielded the form **śuwām-ne*. Since the *-ā-* of *śuwā-* is radical in the subjunctive as well as in other stems of this verb (cf. the discussion of this verb and the parallelism with the verb *lākā-* in §9.2.2 below), so that the subjunctive stem *śuwā-* is in reality an athematic subjunctive of class I and not of class V, the non-initial accentuation of this stem does not contradict Marggraf's findings that transitive subjunctives of class V have initial accent.

The only problem one might have with *eśuwatte** is the absence of *u*-umlaut in the initial syllable, cf. B *onuwaññe* 'immortal' < **æn-nuwaññyæ* (§17.2.3). As the verb *śuwā-* derives from earlier **śyuwā-* < I.-E. **ǵi(e)uH₂-*, it might perhaps be suggested that the *-y-* of the original initial sequence **śy-* protected the prefixal vocalism from being rounded.

§9.2.2. The second privative, *eñkalpatte** is more problematic. It is attested only once in a very fragmentary context: 26 Š b5 ///(*pe*)*m=e*)*kalpaiccets la[ni](ts)e*///, for which Sieg & Siegling 1949: 44 suggest the translation: "... von denen, die einen Grad nicht erlangt haben, leicht ...". Clearly, *eñkalpatte** must be formed to the verb *kālp-* 'to attain'; the process of that formation will be discussed presently. First, it may be noted, however, that the pre-suffixal *-ai-* of the attested form can be seen as parallel to the *-ai-* of such privatives as *ayātaicce*

(§8.4.4) and *empalkaicci* (§9.1.3). K. T. Schmidt 1986: 638 has pointed out that in colloquial West Tocharian ("westtocharische Umgangssprache") an accentuated *a* (i.e. < **ä*) sporadically appears as *ai* before palatals and that the same phenomenon can sometimes be observed in literary eastern dialect texts. The *-ai-* of the privatives just mentioned is not synchronically accentuated, however, and does not reflect an earlier **ä*; on the contrary, it is unaccented and reflects an earlier **ā*. K. T. Schmidt's description of the phenomenon must therefore be changed to the effect that it would pertain to the sound [a] whether accented or not.

Now, the subjunctive stem of *kālp-* is of class VI, i.e. **kālpnā-* > *källā-* (e.g. abstract *källālñe* 14 Š a6). Since *eñkalpatte** clearly is not formed to a stem with a suffixal nasal, Marggraf (1970: 43, 45), for one, suggests a derivation of this privative from the preterite stem *kālpā-*. There is a group of further derivatives that on the surface may appear to be connected with preterite stems, i.e. *atraikatte*, *ešpirtatte*, *aikatte*, *aitkatte*, and *ayātatte*. However, as discussed in §8sq. above, these privatives are all formed to causative verbs and their alleged connection with preterites of class II was shown to be mistaken. Their formation, therefore, offers no support for the assumption that *eñkalpatte** should be taken as formed to a preterite. That is, in spite of appearances, subjunctive stem origin must be sought for *eñkalpatte** as all other privatives.

Actually, there are good reasons to believe that the subjunctive VI formation **kālpnā-* is secondary and that it has replaced an earlier subjunctive V formation. Thus, there is the fact that in East Tocharian the corresponding verb *kālp-* forms a subjunctive of class V, whereas the present stem is of class VI. It might be suggested that this was the earlier situation in West Tocharian as well, esp. in view of the stem formational

pattern of B *kālp-*. This verb belongs to a small group of verbs that form presents of class IX in *-āṣṣā-/āṣke-* and preterites of class I in *-ā-*; apart from *kālp-* with its subjunctive VI, the three other verbs of this group form subjunctives V in *-ā-*. These are *lāk-* 'to see', *wātk-* 'to separate; decide', *mlut-* 'to pluck'(?); viz.

verb	pres.	subj.	pret.
<i>lāk-</i>	<i>lākāṣṣā-</i>	<i>lākā-</i>	<i>lyākā-</i>
<i>wātk-</i>	<i>wātkāṣṣā-</i>	<i>wātkā-</i>	<i>wātkā-</i>
<i>mlut-</i>	<i>mlutāṣṣā-</i>	<i>mlutā-</i>	unattested

The present formation *kālpāṣṣā-*, combined with the preterite *kālpā-*, would in this system require a subjunctive V **kālpā-*, as would agree with the corresponding East Tocharian subjunctive. If the previous existence of such a subjunctive stem in West Tocharian can be accepted, as would not seem unmotivated, the privative *eñkalpatte** agrees perfectly with that stem as far as stem formation is concerned as well as with regard to the retention of the nasal.

Though it can thus be argued that the subjunctive stem to *kālp-* was originally of class V, it must not be concealed that the suffixal accentuation of this stem — independently established, on the one hand, by system considerations, i.e. the parallelism with *lākā-*, *mlutā-*, and *wātkā-*, and, on the other hand, by the retention of the prefixal nasal of the privative — is somewhat surprising in view of *kālp-* being a transitive verb. Even though the East Tocharian subjunctive V forms of this verb are found only in the middle, and one could therefore assume that the corresponding postulated West Tocharian subjunctive V also had middle forms, it would still have been expected to find the transitive subjunctive **kālpā-* accentuated on the radical syllable. It should be

noted, however, that while the suffixal accent of the intransitive *wātkā́*- is expected (whereas in the case of *mlutā́*- the meaning of the verb *mlut*- is too unclear to allow a conclusion as to whether this verb was transitive or intransitive, although the former is perhaps more likely, cf. W 32 b3 *skrenantse paruwa mlutā́šāllona* 'dove's feathers are to be plucked(?)', in which case the suffixal accentuation of *mlutā́*- is unexpected), the transitive subjunctive V *lākā́*- also shows suffixal accentuation. Marggraf (1970: 29) comments on this and suggests that the *-ā-* of this verb might be interpreted as a stem final (i.e. radical) element and not as a subjunctive V marker, cf. also Adams 1988: 65; that is, *lākā́*- might be seen as an athematic subjunctive I.

Such an interpretation might seem difficult in view of the fact that the element *-ā-* does not appear in every formation of this verb. Thus, it is absent in the causative, cf. the present IX participle *lakā́skemane*, or the preterite IV *lakā́šša-me*. However, even verbs with an etymologically ascertainable root-final *-ā-* drop that sound in their causative formations, cf. e.g. the verb B *ānā́sk*- 'to inhale', which forms a non-causative present IX *ānā́ššā-/ānā́ške**, contrasting with a causative present IX *ānā́ššā**/*ānā́ške*-. Whether one follows the commonly accepted analysis of this verb as reflecting the preform **H₂enH₁-ské/o-*, or — as I propose — reconstructs the preform **H₁ṇ-H₂ṇH₁-ské/o-* (i.e. prefix meaning 'in' + zero grade root + suffix, cf. discussion in §16.1.4) the second *-ā-* of *ānā́sk*- must be radical. Nonetheless it is dropped in the causative. The lack of *-ā-* in the causative formation of *lāk*- would therefore not necessarily disprove Marggraf's suggestion that the *-ā-* found in the subjunctive stem *lākā́*- may be radical. The lack of *-ā-* in the non-causative past participle *lyelyku* could be more problematical, but it

does have a parallel in the verb *śuwā́-* (in the handbooks *śwā́-/śu-*) 'to eat', which demonstrably has a radical *-ā́-*. Etymologically, this verb reflects I.-E. **ǵjeuH₂-* (cf. Russian Ch. Sl. *žĭvati* 'to chew', Gmc. **k(j)ewwjan-* 'to chew', etc., Pokorny 1959: 400), that yielded Common Toch. **ś(y)āwā́-* > **śuwā́-*, cf. B present V (3rd sg.) *śwām-ne* (< **śuwām-ne*), present participle *śawāñca* (< **śawāñcā* < **ǵjē/ouH₂-nt-*), subjunctive V infinitive *śwātsi* (< **śuwātsi*), preterite Iaα (3rd sg.) *śuwa* (< **śúwā* < **śuwā́*), (3rd pl.) *śawāre* (< **śāwāre*), all preserving the radical *-ā́-*, but the past participle *śesū* lacks the *-ā́-*. Whatever the reason for the participle *śesū* beside the subjunctive V *śuwā́-* to the radical *śuwā́-*, it is quite parallel to the participle *lyelyku* beside the subjunctive V *lākā́-* to the radical *lākā́-*.

That is to say, the lack of *-ā́-* in the causative formations and in the non-causative past participle of this verb need not deter us from following Marggraf (and Adams) in interpreting *lākā́-* as a verbal root, whose final *-ā́-* was not (synchronically) suffixal and whose accentuation, therefore, was not dictated by the verb's transitivity or intransitivity. Seeing as *lākā́-* and *kālpā́-* (along with *wātkā́-* and *mlutā́-*) form an exclusive group in West Tocharian, it would seem but a short step to suggest that the *-ā́-* of *kālpā́-* is a radical element, parallel to that of *lākā́-*, which would make the non-initial accentuation acceptable.

This suggestion might draw further support from the following: in the middle voice B *lākā́-* serves as a present as well as a subjunctive stem, and in East Tocharian the present stem of the corresponding verb is *lākā-* of class V. These circumstances might be taken to indicate that the present IX formation B *lākā́ṣṣā-* is an innovation for an earlier present V ***lākā́-*. In a parallel manner, the present IX formation of B

kālpāṣṣä- could be seen as an innovation for an earlier present V ***kālpā̃-*. In the case of this verb, however, the situation is a bit more complicated than in the case of *lākā̃-*: while the subjunctive stem A *kālpā-* could support the claim of a previous subjunctive B **kālpā-*, the East Tocharian present stem of this verb is *kālpnā-*, not ***kālpā-*, agreeing with the West Tocharian subjunctive stem *kālpnā̃-*. As argued above, this latter form must be secondary as a subjunctive stem, and could be seen as an original present stem. That is to say, the evidence of both languages points to a present VI *kālpnā̃-* and not to a present V **kālpā̃-* parallel to *lākā̃-*. However, as implied by Winter 1980: 441-442, *-nā-* has enjoyed some productivity as a transitive marker in Tocharian, and Adams 1988: 69 remarks that in both Tocharian languages *-nā-* has often been secondarily extended to distinguish presents from subjunctives in *-ā-* in those verbs that originally did not distinguish the two formations. The suggestion would therefore seem well within reason that not only the present IX B *kālpāṣṣä-* but also the present VI A *kālpnā-* (and the subjunctive VI B *kālpnā̃-*) are secondary replacements of an original present stem ***kālpā̃-* with a (synchronically) verb radical final *-ā̃-*. If this is correct, the verbal roots ***lākā̃-* and ***kālpā̃-* were originally parallel to the verb AB *śuwā̃-* 'to eat' that forms a present V (*śuwā̃-*) in both languages and a subjunctive V (*śuwā̃-*) in West Tocharian (suppletive in East Tocharian). A present ***kālpā̃-* beside the subjunctive B **kālpā̃-* would support the claim that the final *-ā̃-* of this verb was radical and not suffixal. The final accentuation of this subjunctive would be acceptable, because the question of the verb's transitivity or intransitivity has relevance only for subjunctives in a synchronically suffixal *-ā̃-*.

Accentuation patterns in subjunctive classes I and II

§10. We now move on to three groups of privatives all of which are characterized by a stem final *-ä-* before the privative suffix *-tte*. A few preliminary remarks are required, however, concerning the accentuation of athematic class I and thematic class II subjunctives. First, it must be borne in mind that the thematic vowel B *-ä- ~ -e-* (I.-E. **-e- ~ *-o-*) that characterizes present and subjunctive class II (and present class VIII) always carries the accent. There is an indication that this need not always have been so, for in the position VC(C)__tV the thematic vowel is always lost (cf. e.g. *aik-* 'to know' with present II *aikemar* 'I know' but *aištär* 'he knows' < **aišätär* where one might have expected the retention of the medial *-ä-*). This syncope must have occurred before the rules of accentuation were laid down and, therefore, is of no relevance for the statement expressed above, namely, that the thematic vowel is always accentuated in West Tocharian, cf. Marggraf 1970: 22, and esp. 18-21.

The second remark concerns the accentuation of the athematic subjunctives I. As shown by Marggraf (*o.c.*, p. 33), ablauting subjunctives of class I always have initial accent and they are accompanied by preterites of class III that also have initial accent. Furthermore, non-ablauting class I subjunctives accompanied by preterites of class III also have initial accent. Contrarily, non-ablauting subjunctives of class I accompanied by preterites of class I have suffixal accent. The athematic class I has no suffix. It may therefore appear ludicrous to speak of suffixal accent in class I. However, the "suffix" of class I is the anaptyctic *-ä-* that one could assume — for the sake of convenience — was inserted between any root final and suffix initial

consonants. This anaptyctic vowel was again lost in the position VC(C)___tV, as was the thematic vowel. In non-ablauting paradigms, where a subjunctive of class I was accompanied by a preterite of class I, the anaptyctic vowel carried the accent, whereas in ablauting and non-ablauting paradigms, where a subjunctive I was accompanied by a preterite of class III, the anaptyctic vowel was unaccentuated. These phenomena are discussed in a slightly differing manner by Marggraf 1970: 18-22, 31-37, and will be illustrated more fully here. The material is taken from Krause's grammar of West Tocharian (Krause 1952) and I only cite forms whose accentuation can be ascertained (i.e. MQ-forms and possible MQ-forms are omitted). Note that in the infinitive the anaptyctic vowel is always lost, which is probably caused by the same factor as the loss of the -ä- (thematic or anaptyctic) in forms of the type *aištär* from **aišätär*, etc.

Examples of the pattern subjunctive I with initial accent combined with preterite III with initial accent are as follows (preterite forms are shown here in parentheses, if they do no more than indicate the preterite formation without actually revealing its accentuation):

verb	subjunctive	preterite
<i>er-</i> 'to produce'	<i>é[rä]nt[rä]</i> 522 Š b8 <i>értsi</i> 12 Š b6	<i>érsamai</i> 400 S b2
<i>kau-</i> 'to kill'	<i>kāwālne</i> 358 M b3 <i>káutsi</i>	(<i>k[áu]sa</i> 59 Š a1)
<i>prek-</i> 'to ask'	<i>prékän-ne</i> 92 Š a3	<i>párksante</i> 577 M a6
<i>yop-</i> 'to enter'	<i>yópäm-ne</i> 41 Š b3	<i>yópsa-ne</i> 88 Š a3

In the following instances the crucial forms are attested in Hoernle texts or in texts from the Paris collection. A positive identification of their place of origin, therefore, cannot be made.

However, these texts show no signs of MQ-spelling practices. It is fairly likely then that they actually reveal the accentuation of the forms in question:

<i>tek-</i> 'to touch'	<i>tékä(ṃ)-me</i> H 149. 71 b2 (<i>téksa-ne</i> Lévi K 11 b3)
<i>nāk-</i> 'to reproach'	<i>nākälyñe</i> Lévi U 18 b2 <i>nāksate</i> 337 Š a1
<i>plu-</i> 'to glide'	<i>plúwälyñe</i> H 149. 81 b5 ([p]ly(é) ũ[sa] 365 MQR a3)

Further forms probably show the same pattern, although the interpretation of specific forms may sometimes be ambiguous. Thus the verb B *ku-* 'to pour', which forms subjunctive I (*kewu* PK 13. 8 a6, *kutär* 324 M b2) seems to have initial accent in the abstract [*kw*]älñe (28 Š a6), i.e. = **kúwälyñe*, which would correspond to the preterite III absolutive *kekuwer* (307 M b3), which, in view of the ablauting subjunctive, is hardly formed to a preterite I stem. To B *eñk-* 'to seize' there is a subjunctive I (*eñktär*) that forms the gerundive *eñkälle* (Lévi K 9 a2) and the abstract *eñkälyñe* (Lévi U 11 a2), both of which probably have initial accent in view of the preterite III *eñksate* Sp 39. The same pattern is in all probability to be assumed in several further verbs (B *aul-* (?) 'to throw in', *käl-* 'to tolerate', *treñk-* 'to cling to', *plätk-* 'to come forth', *yärp-* 'to observe'⁶⁴, *wätk-* 'to separate', *sin-* 'to be oppressed', *sain-* 'to support oneself'). I am aware of only one exception to this pattern. The verb B *aun-* act. 'to meet', med. 'to begin', appears to show suffixal accentuation in the 3rd plural subjunctive I form *aunantär* of 27 Š b7 in spite of preterite III forms with initial accent: 83 Š 3 *au(ṃ)tsate* and 16 Š b3 *auntsante*. Probably *aunantär* is an error for

⁶⁴ Actually, *yärp-* forms a subjunctive of class II as seen by the form of the privative *airpitte** alternating with *airpätte**, cf. §12.7 below.

aunäntär, cf. in the same text, line a2, *mäsketär* for correct *mäsketar* (Sieg / Siegling 1949: 45, n. 9).

The pattern subjunctive I with suffixal accent combined with preterite I with suffixal accent is far less common. Fully represented is perhaps only the verb *sälp*-:

verb	subjunctive	preterite
<i>sälp</i> - 'to glow'	<i>sälpälle</i> 'fever' 497 Š a8 (<i>sälpá(ts)i</i> H 149. add. 134 b6)	(<i>sälpǎ-ne</i> H 149. 288 a4)

In the following instances some relevant forms may be lacking, but the pattern is still recognizable; the accentuation of the forms in parentheses has been inferred:

<i>ai</i> - 'to give'	<i>ayú-ne</i> 25 Š a7, 99 Š a5	supplt., but ptc. <i>āyu</i> *
<i>träñk</i> - 'to lament'	<i>träñkályñe</i> 89 Š b4	unattested
<i>nes</i> - 'to be'	<i>nesälle</i> frequent	suppletive
<i>miw</i> - 'to move'	(<i>maiwátsi</i> H 149. 233 b3) (<i>maiwátsi</i> PK 13 9 b7) (<i>maiwálñe</i> Y 3 a2)	<i>maiwǎte</i> 85 Š b5
<i>päkw</i> - 'to trust'	<i>pkwǎlle</i> 23 Š b8 etc. <i>pkwálñe</i> 84 Š b2	unattested
<i>yaukk</i> - 'to use'	[y](au)kkálñä (°e)196 M a6	(<i>yaukkǎte-ne</i> 373 Qu b5)

The same pattern is found in B *soy*- 'to be satiated', although it is less transparent due to the regular loss of accentuated *-ä-* in the position after *-y-* in the relevant attested subjunctive derivate *soylñe* 32 Š b6, etc. The preterite I *soyǎre* is attested in H 149. add. 122 a2. Further examples are probably to be seen in *wäs*- 'to dress', infinitive *wastsi*, preterite I *wässǎte* Sp. 39, *wärsk*- 'to smell', infinitive *warstsi*, preterite I *wä[r]sk[ǎ]nte* 576 MQ a2.

A similar pattern is found in the verb *yām-* 'to do', but here the subjunctive I *yāmā-* (404 Š b8 *yamāmtār*, 17 Š a5 *yamāntār*, 598 M a1 *yamālle*, etc.) is accompanied by preterite IV *yāmāššā-* (109 S a8 *yamāšša*, etc.).

Privatives in Common Tocharian -*ättæ* Group IIa

§11. Bearing in mind these two principles (first, the thematic vowel is always accentuated, and second, the anaptyctic vowel that arose in athematic class I verbs is accentuated, if accompanied by a preterite of class I (or IV), but unaccentuated, if accompanied by a preterite of class III), we shall now inspect the privatives of a few other groups.

Group IIa

privative	pres.	subj.	pret.	past ptc.
<i>alālätte</i>	<i>lālāššā</i> -* IX	<i>lālyí</i> - IV	<i>lālyá</i> - Ibα	<i>lalālu</i>
<i>amplākätte</i>	unattested	unattested	<i>plākā</i> - Ibα Qu	unattested
Caus.	<i>plākšā</i> -* VIIIb	<i>plākā</i> - I	unattested	unattested
<i>anāyätte</i>	<i>āiššā</i> - IX	<i>āyá</i> - I	suppletive	<i>āyu</i> *
<i>empakwätte</i>	<i>pāk(w(á))</i> - I	<i>pāk(wá)</i> - I	unattested	unattested
<i>ontsoytte</i>	<i>soy(á)</i> - I	<i>soyá</i> - I	<i>soyá</i> - Ibα H	<i>sosoyu</i>

This second group of privatives confirms the conclusion drawn from the material of the first group, i.e., that the privatives are not derived from the present stem. Moreover, we can exclude the preterite stem as the basis of the privatives. The preterite stem in Group IIa has a final *-ā-* which is not present in the privatives. This leaves us with the subjunctive stem as the prime candidate that would furnish the basis for the privatives.

The five privatives of Group IIa can be relatively easily derived from their respective subjunctive I stems. Every form requires a comment though, for there are details and minor complications that must be cleared.

§11.1. First, the privative *anāyätte* 'ungiven' derives from the subjunctive I stem *āyǎ-* to the verb *ai-* 'to give'. The nasal of the prefix is, of course, regularly preserved before vowel. It was indicated above that *-ä-* is lost in Tocharian in the sequence *-yǎ-* whether accented or not. Such development may perhaps be postulated for the present IX *aiššä-* if from **āyǎššä-* (cf. *lālǎššä-* to the verb *lāl-* 'to be tired'; for the absence of accentuation on the thematic vowel of the suffix *-ššä-* / *-ske-*, cf. §13.2sq. below). The *-ä-* of *anāyätte*, however, is preserved (or reintroduced), perhaps because of the consonant cluster(?), i.e. the sequence **-āyätt-* is preserved instead of **-āytt-*, which would also have been possible, cf. *ontsoytte* beside *ontsoyätte** to *soyǎ-*. It seems likely that *anāyätte* is a prose form, for all attested instances are found in prose texts (H 149. add. a3, a4, a6, KVāc. 9 b3, b4), and that one might expect to find *anāytte** (or *anaitte**) in verse. For *ontsoytte* and *ontsoyätte**, cf. immediately below.

§11.2. Second, *ontsoytte* 'insatiable, unsatisfied' (with derivatives) is well attested.⁶⁵ It is formed to the subjunctive I *soyǎ-* to the verb *soy-* 'to be satiated' in a quite regular manner. The accentuation of the subjunctive stem is not responsible for the retention of the prefixal nasal, for that nasal is regularly preserved, if the prefixal vocalism is rounded. The form *ontsoytte* and its abstract derivate *ontsoyttñe* is attested without a pre-suffixal *-ä-* eight times — always in verse. On the other hand, *ontsoyätte** is attested five times with a pre-suffixal *-ä-*: four times in prose, and once

⁶⁵ Thus we find *ontsoyätte* / *ontsoytte* in 71 Š 5, 133 MQR a4, 213 MQR b4, 622 X b5, Lévi S 6 b5, H 149. 38 a6, H 149. 288 a6, H 149. add. 134 a3, H add. 149. 124 b5, and *ontsoy(t)ñe* in 1 Š b8, 22 Š a4, 33 Š b1, H 149. add. 28 b2.

in verse, cf. the discussion of *anāyätte* (prose form) above. The prefixal vocalism of *ontsoytte* / *ontsoyätte** has been regularly unlauted through the effect of the following radical *o*-vocalism.

§11.2.1. In East Tocharian the privative *asinät* has the same meaning as B *ontsoytte*. It is clearly not formed in the same manner though, and indeed the East and West Tocharian paradigms of the verb 'to satiate; be satisfied' are quite different in their morphological build-up although they derive from the same Indo-European verbal root.

A *si-*, *si-n-* 'to satiate; be satisfied' forms a non-causative present of class X (in *-näs/š-*, cf. 3sg. med. *sinäštär*) and a subjunctive of class VII (in *-ñä/a-*, cf. 3pl. med. *siñantär*) and a preterite III (in *-sā-*, cf. 2 sg. med. *simṣāte*). This would at first seem to contradict our contention that the privatives are always formed to the subjunctive stems of their underlying verbs for no subjunctive stem **sinä-* seems to be attested. However, the East Tocharian subjunctives of class VII are always matched by West Tocharian subjunctives of class I and there are reasons to believe that the subjunctives of class VII in East Tocharian are a late formation that has replaced an earlier subjunctive I formation, cf. my detailed investigation of this problem in a forthcoming paper⁶⁶. The privative A *asinät* thus bears witness to an earlier and different subjunctive formation than the otherwise current subjunctive VII *siñä/a-*.

§11.3. Third, *empakwätte** 'unreliable, untrustworthy' can be considered regular to the subjunctive I *päkwä-* to the verb *päkw-* 'to trust'. The retention of the prefixal nasal is in perfect accord with the theory proposed here that that phenomenon is conditioned by the suffixal accentuation of the underlying basic form, i.e. the subjunctive stem. Actually, this privative is attested only once and the form is H 149. 15 b3

⁶⁶ "The elements *-ñ-* and *-ññ-* in Tocharian present and subjunctive classes", *TIES* 5, 1991.

empakwaccai. However, the text in question shows many MQ-characteristics (e.g. line a1 *sānkāmpā* for *sānkāmpa*, line b4 *āyātaicce* for *ayātaicce*), so that the pre-suffixal *-a-* of *empakwaccai* can safely be regarded as reflecting an underlying *-ä-*. This *-ä-* is in fact confirmed by the abstract *ompakwättñe* of 3 Š b3. In this latter form, a rounding of *e-* to *o-* has taken place in the position before *-mp-*. Such a rounding was not infrequent in West Tocharian, cf. B *ompalskoññe* 'meditation' (§17.1.4), *omprotärtstse** 'brotherly' (§17.1.6), *oppilom* (§17.1.11), cf. Hilmarsson 1986: 58. Clearly, this sound change constituted a tendency rather than a sound law as shown by forms like *empakwätte**, *emparkre* 'at length' (§18.1.2), etc.

§11.4. Fourth, *alālätte* 'untiring, indefatigable' is well attested.⁶⁷ The main problem concerns its relationship with the subjunctive IV stem *lālyi-* to the verb *lāl-* 'to be tired'. The subjunctive IV is characterized by a palatalizing and accentuated *-i-*. Since subjunctive and optative forms are essentially identical in this class⁶⁸ and because this class is found only in West and not in East Tocharian, one is tempted to conclude that it is a West Tocharian innovation, or more precisely, that the subjunctives in *-i-* are in origin optatives that have taken over the function of the subjunctives. Unfortunately, only one of the five West Tocharian verbs of this class has a correspondence in East Tocharian. This is the verb B *ākl-* = A *ākl-* 'to learn', which, however, shows no subjunctive forms in East Tocharian. That language, therefore, does not offer a clue as to the original subjunctive formation here. However, it is evident that a putative optative

⁶⁷ Attested at 77 Š a2, 102 Š 1, 203 MQR b2, 204 Ot a1, 365 MQR b2, 600 MQ a4, Pe 2 a4 (*non vidi*), PK 17. 1 a5 (Couvreur 1954: 86), KVāc. 17 b5 (K. T. Schmidt 1986).

⁶⁸ Apparently, there is a slight difference in that the subjunctive IV has athematic 3pl. forms (e.g. *ālyintār* MQ 'they will keep away') while the optative has thematic 3pl. forms (e.g. *aklyiyenträ* Š 'they would learn'). This may be a secondary feature though.

stem *lālyí-* is not formed to a suffixed (i.e., if one does not consider the thematic vowel as a suffix) subjunctive (a subjunctive V in *-ā-* would have yielded an optative in *-oy-*), which leaves us with the choice between an original athematic subjunctive I and a thematic subjunctive II.

Krause 1952: 83-85 lists 19 verbs as non-causatives of present class IX (a-g) with the formative *-(ä)ššä-* / *-(ä)ske-*. Three of these verbs have no attested subjunctive forms (*re-* 'to flow', *lyyā-* 'to rub out', *spālk-* 'to make an effort'), two are accompanied by class V subjunctives (*nān-* 'to show oneself', *tin-* 'to be dirty(?)'), two by class IV subjunctives (*lāl-* 'to exert oneself', *wäs-* 'to stay'), and one by a class VII subjunctive (*we-* 'to say'). The remaining 11 verbs are either clearly accompanied by class I subjunctives (*ai-* 'to give', *wäs-* 'to dress', *āl-* 'to keep away', *eñk-* 'to seize', *yām-* 'to do', *yāsk-* 'to beg', *treñk-* 'to be attached') or by subjunctive forms that can be either of class I or II (*kālm-* 'to accord', *lut-* 'to remove', *sāmp-* 'to take away') or of class I or V (*yaukk-* 'to use'). That is to say, the bulk of non-causative present class IX (a-g) verbs are accompanied by subjunctives of class I, and even the three verbs that Krause classifies as either of class I or class II are probably to be interpreted as class I — at least the verb *lut-* that shows the 3rd singular medium subjunctive form *lyutātār* without palatalization.

With most present class IX (a-g) verbs being accompanied by subjunctives of class I, and, furthermore, in view of the likelihood that the subjunctive class IV is a secondary formation in West Tocharian, originating as an optative form to a subjunctive of class I (or II), it would seem a none too hazardous guess that the two verbs of subjunctive class IV, i.e. *lāl-* and *wäs-* 'to stay', originally formed subjunctives of class I. That is, B *lāl-*, with the present IX *lālāššä-**, formed a subjunctive **lālā́-* of class I (not **lālā-*, for its preterite is of class I, not III), from which an

optative **lālyí-* was derived that later took over the subjunctive function also. Such a series of forms would be precisely paralleled by the verb *āl-*, with the present IX *ālāššä-**, subjunctive I *ālā́-* (infinitive *āltsi*), and the optative *ālyí-**.

As far as the privative *alālätte* to the verb *lāl-* is concerned, it thus seems safe to conclude that it is formed to an original subjunctive class I stem with a non-palatal root final consonant, in spite of the attested subjunctive IV form of this verb. Of course, the subjunctive IV, being an original optative form, has a palatal final caused by the optative marker *-i-* (< **-yä-* < **-iH₁-*). Loss of the prefixal nasal before *-l-* is regular.

§11.5. Fifth, the privative *amplākätte* to the verb *plāk-*. This verb is not frequently attested in either Tocharian language. There is therefore some uncertainty as to its precise meaning. In the handbooks B *plāk-* is assigned the intransitive sense 'einverstanden sein' (Krause 1952: 264, Thomas & Krause 1964: 216) 'Être d'accord avec' (Van Windekens 1976: 377), etc. The corresponding causative form is translated 'um Erlaubnis bitten' (when accompanied by an object in the oblique case — once only) and 'sich verständigen mit' (when accompanied by the comitative case — also once only) (Krause, *l.c.*), whereas Thomas / Krause (*l.c.*) translate here 'um Einverständnis bitten, sich ins Benehmen setzen mit', and Van Windekens (*l.c.*) 'demander l'accord de, se mettre en rapport avec'. The East Tocharian verb is similarly translated.

Actually, there are only causative forms attested in East Tocharian, viz. the causative preterite IIIb which is found three times in the 3rd person singular. Its meaning is quite clearly 'asked permission' as seen in 394 a4 *waštāš lāntāssi plāksāt waštāš lāntāssi tärkor mā kälpāt* '(he/she) asked permission to leave the house, (but) (he/she) did not get consent to leave the house', cf. also 80 b5, 436 a1, where the context is

similar. A corresponding preterite IIIb is not found in West Tocharian (unless perhaps the form 587 MQR b5 *plyakwa* is to be interpreted thus, but the context here is unclear). However, a causative is probably to be seen in the infinitive B *plāktsi* in the context 516 M a2 *sāswenās plāktsi watkāṣṣām*, which can be translated 'he orders to give permission to the lords' or 'he orders (sby) to acquire permission for the lords' or even 'he orders (sby) to ask permission for the lords'. B *plāktsi* can hardly be interpreted as a non-causative here, cf. shortly below. Krause 1952: 264 lists a further causative form to this verb, i.e. B *plakṣiyem*, a 3rd plural imperfect to a present of class VIIIb. However, its context seems to rule out the causative meaning 'to ask or acquire permission', for the text reads 592 M a3 *(tā)w(mpa) māka onolmi plakṣiyem*, which must be translated '(with he)r many beings were in accord'. The meaning here, viz. 'to be in accord, to be agreement with', would fit much better the meaning of the non-causative stem as given by the handbooks, cf. above.

If B *plakṣiyem* is to be interpreted as a non-causative, it cannot be seen as an imperfect to a present stem VIII, which it would have been (so classified by Krause), if it had been a causative. The causatives of present class VIIIb are always accompanied by preterites of class III (Krause 1952: 79). Non-causatives of present class VIIla are also usually accompanied by preterites of class III, except in two instances where we have preterites I (to B *yuk-* 'to overcome', and to *lup-* 'to throw; to smear'). Both exceptions form subjunctives of class V, however, and are therefore not parallel to our verb B *plāk-*, which — as will become clear — forms a subjunctive of class I or II. The non-causative preterite Iba **plākā-* (Qu *plaka*), discussed immediately below, requires that the imperfect *plakṣiyem* be interpreted as formed to a present IX *plākāṣṣā-*

with loss of accentuated *-ā-* in a metrical text, cf. e.g. the imperfect *yāmsyem* (3 Š b1) to the present IX *yāmāššā-* of *yām-* 'to do'.

Unfortunately, the non-causative stem is very poorly attested. The pres. XII *plākāntār* of PK 12 J a5, cited by Krause 1952: 264 and Van Windekens 1976: 377, is non-existent according to Couvreur 1954: 84 who reads *[sklo]kāntār* 'ist verzweifelt' instead. The only remaining form on Krause's list (*l.c.*) is 491 Qu III a1 *plaka* (MQ-writing for **plāka*), a preterite of class Ib α . The text is as follows: *pawaške ece mlaše plaka*, and Sieg 1950: 222-223 is probably not far from the truth when he translates this passus with 'Pawaške bestätigte den Eingang', cf. also Thomas 1957: 145 with fn. 1: 'hat bestätigt'. However, in view of the meaning of the causative ('to ask permission, to acquire consent'), and in view of the intransitive meaning of the imperfect form *plakšiyem*, as discussed above, it would seem necessary to translate the non-causative preterite **plākā-* with 'agreed, was in accord'. The text 491 Qu III a1 could then be translated: 'Pawaške ... agreed' or 'Pawaške ... was in accord'. The word *mlaše* is a *hapax legomenon* of unknown meaning, and we cannot know whether it is to be seen as an object of the verb or an attribute of the proper name. The latter seems to me a more reasonable choice, because of the intransitive meaning of the non-causative *plakšiyem*.

The preterite stem **plākā-* cannot by itself reveal whether it is to be interpreted as a preterite of class Ib α (with a past participle **paplāku*) or of class Ib β (with a past participle **paplākau*). However, in combination with the present stem IX *plākāššā-* (imperfect *plakšiyem*), the former is a far more probable alternative, for such presents are frequently accompanied by preterites of class Ib α , whereas there is only a single attested instance of a preterite Ib β along with present IX.

The combination of a non-causative present IX and a preterite Iba definitely indicates a subjunctive of class I or of class II (or IV, but forms of this class have replaced previous class I or II forms, as discussed above). For the basic verb B *plāk-* the following stem forms can thus be posited: present IX *plākāṣṣä-* ~ subjunctive I *plākā-* or II *plāśā-* ~ preterite Iba *plākā-* (~ past participle **paplāku*). For the final *-ā-* of the subjunctive forms and the question of its accentuation, see §10 above.

The causative of A *plāk-*, as we have seen, formed a preterite of class IIIb. Such a preterite is in all probability to be assumed for West Tocharian also (and may even be attested in 587 MQR b5 *plyakwa*, whose context is quite obscure, however). In all attested instances, the causative preterites of class IIIb accompany presents of class VIIIb. The combination of the causative present VIIIb and preterite IIIb requires without exception a subjunctive of class II. Such a pattern is attested in the case of the causatives of the verbs B *pālk-*, *rāk-*, *tsām-*, *trik-* *luk-*, to name but a few. Thus for the causative verb B *plāk-* the following stem forms can be posited: present VIIIb *plākṣā-* ~ subjunctive II *plāśā-* (or *plākā-*, cf. below) ~ preterite IIIb *plāk-s-* (past participle *paplāku*).

The question then arises, whether it was the non-causative subjunctive stem or the causative subjunctive stem that provided the basis for the privative *amplākätte*. Let us first see, whether that question can be decided on semantic grounds.

In the handbooks B *amplākätte* is translated 'without permission, not having been permitted'. This is certainly a fitting translation in all its occurrences, cf. H 149. add. 8 a3 *dhanike ñem ṣamāne ajātaśatruñ lānte amplākätte or kamāte* 'a monk named Dhanike took the wood of king Ajātaśatru without permission', 108 S a2 *amplākätte mā rittetār-me o(stameṃ lalñe)* 'it does not behoove us to leave the house without

permission', H 149. X 3 (= HMR 1) b1 *se šamāne ... amplākätte parra tseñketār* 'a monk who ... arises without permission', same text b2 *se šamāne ... amplākätte kwašaine yinmaššām* 'a monk who ... goes to town without permission'. But how is the phrase 'without permission' to be interpreted? If it means 'without asking for permission', then *amplākätte* must be associated with the causative stem of the verb, but if it means 'without consent (i.e. not having been agreed)', then *amplākätte* must be connected with the non-causative stem.

Thus there are no semantic criteria that would help us decide the precise formation of B *amplākätte*. We must then return to the formal criteria. It was indicated above that the non-causative of the verb *plāk-* would be expected to form a subjunctive either of class I or of class II. Verbs that form their stems according to the same pattern as *plāk-* (i.e. present IX ~ subjunctive I or II ~ preterite I) are eleven in all. Seven of them have subjunctive I (*ai-* 'to give', *wārsk-* 'to smell', *āl-* 'to keep away', *yaukk-* 'to use', *wäs-* 'to dress', beside *lāl-* 'to be tired' and *wäs-* 'to dwell'; both the last-mentioned verbs actually form subjunctive IV, which, however, has replaced an earlier subjunctive I stem as argued above §11.4), two have subjunctive II (*yāsk-* 'to beg', *ās-* 'to bring'), and two have subjunctives that are either of class I or II (*kālm-* 'to accord', *sāmp-* 'to remove'). The preponderance of subjunctive I formations in this group of verbs makes it extremely likely that *plāk-* also formed a subjunctive I *plāká-* rather than a subjunctive II *plāšá-*. On the other hand, causatives that form their stems on the same pattern as the causative of *plāk-* always have thematic subjunctives of class II. One would then expect to find a causative subjunctive II *plāšá-* to *plāk-*. However, there are a few instances of subjunctive I forms beside the expected subjunctive II forms to be found among these causatives. Thus the verb B *rāk-* 'to cover' forms a

causative subjunctive II *rāsā-*, but the corresponding infinitive has the form *raktsi*, without palatalization, and must be interpreted as an athematic subjunctive I derivative. Such instances are infrequent (there is also *raṁktsi* to *rānk-* 'to ascend' and *tsaṁktsi* to *tsānk-* 'to flay', cf. Krause 1952: 123, Krause & Thomas 1960: 224), but it seems necessary to view the causative infinitive *plāktsi* in that perspective. That is to say, there probably existed a thematic causative subjunctive II *plāsā-*, as would be normal and expected, but judging by the infinitive *plāktsi* one must assume there was a subjunctive I stem *plākā-* beside *plāsā-*, in the same manner as there was *rākā-* beside *rāsā-*. In combination with the causative preterite III, the subjunctive I would have been accentuated on the initial syllable, i.e. *plākā-*, cf. §10 above.

We have thus arrived at the point that we can say that the non-causative as well as the causative stem of the verb *plāk-* formed, or could form, a subjunctive of class I. These two subjunctive I stems differed in accent only. The non-causative was *plākā-* whereas the causative was *plākā́-*. *A priori* the privative *amplākätte* could be seen as formed to either of these stems. However, should the theory proposed here, according to which the nasal of the prefix is retained, if the basic form had suffixal accentuation, prove to be correct, then *amplākätte* derives from the non-causative subjunctive I stem *plākā-*. This would agree with the formation of the two privatives with preserved nasal that we have investigated so far, i.e. *aṁklautkatte** to *klautkā́-* and *empaḱwätte** to *pāḱwā́-*. Of course, *amplākätte* and *aṁklautkatte** are not decisive in the way *empaḱwätte** is. But the pattern is emerging, and we shall see more clinching examples below.

It can then be concluded that the privatives of Group IIa derive

from subjunctive I stems. These subjunctive stems all have suffixal accentuation.

§11.6. The privative B *ayāmätte* is in most respects identical to those of Group IIa. But since the verb *yām-* forms a preterite IV but not I, this privative can be said to form an subgroup of its own.

privative	pres.	subj.	pret.	past ptc
<i>ayāmätte*</i>	<i>yāmáṣṣā-</i> IX	<i>yāmá-</i> I	<i>yāmáṣṣā-</i> IV	<i>yāmu</i>

This privative is attested at 522 Š b7 in the oblique singular masculine. There is clearly no problem in deriving *ayāmätte** from the subjunctive I stem *yāmá-*. Other verbal stems are excluded. The loss of the prefixal nasal is regular before *-y-*.

Privatives in Common Tocharian *-ättæ* Group IIb

§12. We now move on to the privatives of Group IIb that are derived from verbs that form preterites of class III. Most of these verbs are non-causatives, but some are or may be causatives. Marggraf's findings concerning the accentuation of ablauting subjunctives of class I with accompanying preterites of class III were reported above (§10). Such subjunctives had initial accent. Many of the subjunctives of class I, accompanied by preterites of class III, do not show ablaut, however. This may be accidental or due to analogy, or perhaps they never had any ablaut, but at all events their accentuation is always on the initial syllable also. As shown above there was only a single exception to this, and the

form in question, *aunantär*, may be seen as a mistake for **áunäntär*. The privatives that are formed to such verbs are as follows.

Group IIb privative	pres.	subj.	pret.	past ptc.
<i>anäkätte</i>	<i>nākšā-</i> VIIa	<i>nākä-</i> I	<i>nāk-s-</i> IIIa	<i>nanāku</i>
<i>ekalätte*</i>	<i>kālšā-</i> VIIa	<i>kälä-</i> I	<i>kel-s-</i> IIIa	unattested
<i>etañkätte</i>	<i>ceṃšā-</i> II	<i>tāñkā-</i> I	unattested	unattested
<i>etrenkätte</i>	<i>trenkāššā-</i> IX	<i>trenkā-</i> I	<i>trénk-s-</i> IIIa	<i>tetrenku</i>

to these one must add

<i>anaikätte*</i>	<i>aišā-</i> II	<i>aišä-</i> II	<i>aikā-*</i> Ibα	<i>aiku</i>
Caus.	unattested	unattested	<i>aik-s-</i> IIIb	unattested

and furthermore there is

<i>ekamätte</i>	<i>känmáššā-</i> Xa	<i>šämā-</i> II	<i>šemā-/kämé-</i> IV unatt.
			<i>kām-s-</i> IIIa <i>kekamu</i>

and finally

<i>airpä/itte*</i>	<i>yärpšā-*</i> VIIa	<i>yärpä-</i> II	<i>yerp-s-</i> IIIaβ	unattested
--------------------	----------------------	------------------	----------------------	------------

The privatives of Group IIb confirm the conclusions drawn from previous groups. The present and the preterite stems are excluded as their derivational basis, and it is only the subjunctive that could have produced the privatives in *-ätte*. The initial accentuation of the subjunctives agrees with the retention of the nasal of the privative prefix in the forms *ekalätte** and *ekamätte*, and is therefore in harmony with the theory presented here. A few explicatory comments are required though.

§12.1. First, there is no problem with *anäkätte* 'irreproachable,

blameless, (Skt.) *aninditaḥ*', attested at 20 Š a7 and Lévi U 18 a2. The derivation from the subjunctive I stem *nākä-* is quite straight forward. Although it is of no relevance for this particular privative, the accentuation of this subjunctive I stem can be inferred from the fact that it is accompanied by a preterite of class III. Furthermore, this accentuation may be directly indicated by such forms as Lévi U 18 b2 *nākälyñe*.

§12.2. Second, *ekalätte** is attested only once in the text H 149. 199 a2 where the form is (e)*kältte*. The text has several MQ-characteristics (e.g. line a3 *nākšām*) which accounts for the radical vocalism *-ä-*, and, furthermore, it is a metrical text which accounts for the loss of the pre-suffixal *-ä-*. Unfortunately, the meaning of *ekalätte** is not revealed in the text, which is a mere fragment: /// (e)*kältte* : *wrocce käre* ///. However, Krause's association (1952: 43) of this privative with the verb *käl-* 'to bear, tolerate' and, consequently, the translation 'intolerable' seems very reasonable.

The verb *käl-* forms an ablauting subjunctive of class I (cf. 1st person sg. *kelu*, but infinitive *kaltsi*), accompanied by a preterite of class III (*keltsa*). As indicated above, such subjunctives had initial accentuation. That is to say, the privative *ekalätte** derives from a subjunctive I stem with initial accentuation *kälä-*, so that the loss of the prefixal nasal is normal and in accord with the theory proposed here. Note that the privatives are always formed to the zero grade of the ablauting subjunctive stem.

§12.3. Third, *etanäkätte* is reported by Krause 1952: 43 with the translation 'unhaltbar', but Krause / Thomas 1964: 172 translate 'ungehindert'. This form is found twice in the Petrowski Collection, Pe 2 b1 and b5. This text is not available to me, so that I have not been able to verify the forms or their meaning. However, this privative is in all

probability authentic, for a facsimile of the text in question was read and verified by Sieg and Siegling (unpublished), according to Krause 1952: 311. Furthermore, it has been suggested by Thomas 1983: 151 that the form (*etañkā*)*tte* should be read into the lacuna of 7 Š a3-4, for that text is a rendering of a Sanskrit Udānavarga-text, where the corresponding word is *apratibaddha*-.

It is clear that *etañkātte* must be associated with the verb *tāñk*- 'to impede, hinder'. This verb forms a subjunctive of class I as seen by the well attested infinitive *tañktsi*. Although *tāñk*- forms a thematic present of class II (3rd person pl. act. *ceñkeṃ*, 3rd person sg. med. *c[e]ṃśtrā*), and such presents are usually accompanied by subjunctives of class II, this particular verb — together with the verb *tek*- 'to touch' — forms a specific subgroup within the present class II in that it forms a subjunctive of class I, cf. *tañktsi* and e.g. *tekām-ne*, resp. Furthermore, these two verbs are the only ones in present class II that have a palatalized initial in the present, cf. *c[e]ṃśtrā* and *ceśām*. This parallelism invites the conclusion that the accentuation of the (ablauting) subjunctive I stem *tékā-/tākā*- (e.g. *tékā(ṃ)-ne* H 149. 71 b2, optative *tásim-me* 355 M a5) is repeated in the subjunctive I stem to *tāñk*-, i.e. *tāñkā*-. Subjunctive I with initial accentuation agrees well with the preterite of class III formed by *tek*-, i.e. *teksa*, and such a preterite may safely be assumed for *tāñk*- also. That is to say, *etañkātte* can be seen as regularly formed to the subjunctive I *tāñkā*-, a zero grade which probably alternated with the normal grade **téñkā*-.

§12.3.1. In East Tocharian, a corresponding privative *atāñkāt* is found. A subjunctive I stem is attested there also, cf. 68 a5 *tāñklun(e)*, so that all is as it should be. While *atāñkāt* is attested some four times, there is a slightly different form *atāñkac* attested once, 453 b2. It appears to

have the same meaning: 'unhindered'. The final *-ac* is unexpected: **-āc* might have been interpreted as an oblique singular masculine petrified in adverbial use, and **(ä)c-ac* might have been seen as an allative form.

§12.4. Fourth, *etrenkätte* 'not clinging, not attached' derives from the verb *trēnk-* 'to cling, be attached'. This privative is attested three times, in 248 MQ a3, 289 S a5, 597 M a3, and its meaning is relatively certain, cf. Krause 1952: 43 'ohne Halt', Krause & Thomas 1964: 172 'ohne zu haften'.

The verb *trēnk-* forms a present IXay *trēnkāššä-* and a preterite IIIa *trēnk-s-*. The expected subjunctive in this pattern would be *trēnkä-*, or an apophonic *trēnkä-/trānkä-*, of the athematic class I. None of the forms of this verb show apophony, however, so that the privative formation *etrenkätte* — with normal grade of the root — to a subjunctive I stem *trēnkä-* is quite regular. This subjunctive formation is indicated by the optative *treñcimar* and by the verbal substantive *trēnkäl* 'clinging'.

§12.5. Fifth, *anaikätte**, attested at 12 Š a3 and 278 MQ a1, is translated 'unbemerkt' by Krause 1952: 43 (Krause / Thomas 1964: 162 'unerkannt, unbemerkt') and associated with the verb *aik-* 'to know'; furthermore (*op. cit.*, p. 225), Krause classifies this privative with the non-causative forms of *aik-*. This raises some problems. The verb *aik-* forms a thematic present of class II (*aišä-* / *aikē-*), a subjunctive also of class II (cf. the infinitive *aištsi*), and a preterite I stem *aikā-** (attested is the 2nd person singular *ekasta*).⁶⁹ A privative formed to the subjunctive stem *aišä-** ought to have had the form ***anaišätte* with a palatalized root final consonant, cf. *eniklyaušätte* (for which, cf. §13.1 below) to the thematic subjunctive II stem *klyaušä-*.

⁶⁹ The handbooks class this form as a preterite I (for **aikāsta*), cf. e.g. Krause & Thomas 1960: 242. K. T. Schmidt 1986: 142 claims that it is definitely a preterite of class III. See discussion of this form further on in this paragraph.

To *aik-*, only two, possibly three, causative forms are attested. This is the preterite IIIb (2nd person singular medium) *aiyksātaiy* of 214 MQR a2-3, and KVāc. 31 b1 (3pl.) *aiksante*, possibly beside 204 Ot b3 (2sg. act.) *ekasta*. As shown above (§11.5), all causative preterites of class IIIb accompany presents of class VIIIb. One would then expect a causative present VIIIb **aikšā-*. Furthermore, the combination of present VIIIb and preterite IIIb requires in general a subjunctive of class II. That, is, expected would be a causative subjunctive II **aišā-*. However, as also indicated above (§11.5), there occur a few instances of subjunctive I forms beside the expected subjunctive II forms among such causatives. The examples mentioned above were the infinitive *raktsi* (subj. I) beside *rāšā-* (subj. II) to the verb *rāk-* 'to cover', *raṃktsi* to *rānk-* 'to ascend', *tsaṅktsi* to *tsānk-* 'to flay', and *plāktsi* to *plāk-* 'to ask permission'. It is therefore quite within reason to assume that the causative of *aik-* may have known a subjunctive I stem **áikā-* beside a normal **aišā-*. Contrarily, there is less reason to assume that the non-causative subjunctive II stem also had beside it a subjunctive I, for the attested instances of such a double representation are found only among the causatives, as far as I am able to see.

Since *anaikätte** cannot be derived from the non-causative subjunctive II stem *aišā-*, one is confronted with two options. The one is to derive this privative from the causative subjunctive I stem **áikā-* that may have existed and could have produced the attested privative. The other is to assume that the non-causative subjunctive II stem *aišā-* is a secondary formation that has replaced an earlier subjunctive I **aikā-* that provided the basis for the privative.

The latter alternative is difficult to argue, because a class II subjunctive is normal and expected beside a class II present (ten verbs show this pattern, cf. Krause 1952: 62), whereas a subjunctive I to a

present II is exceptional (only two verbs that also have other exclusive features in common, cf. §12.3). Even though the Indo-European predecessor of B *aik-* appears to have formed a perfect stem only, and therefore, must have had athematic flexion (cf. e.g. the perfect-presentic flexion of this verb in Germanic, viz. Goth. 3rd sg. *aih*, 1st pl. *aigum*, etc.), it would seem too hazardous to project the formation of the privative *anaikätte** back to a period, when Tocharian possessed such a flexion. A more concrete indication might perhaps be seen in the non-palatal root final of the past participle *aiku*. The past participles often appear to have been formed to the same verbal stem as the privatives; *aiku* might therefore be interpreted as the required proof of the previous existence of an athematic non-causative verbal stem. However, all non-causative subjunctives of class II are accompanied by past participles with root final palatalized consonants, e.g. *klyauṣä-* ~ *keklyauṣu*, *pāṣṣä-* ~ *papāṣṣu*, etc. The non-causative *aiśä-* ~ *aiku* is system-breaking. If the non-causative subjunctive stem was athematic originally and was replaced by a thematic formation, one would expect the thematic stem to have been generalized in the entire paradigm, i.e. in the past participle also, even though a reflex of the athematic stem might at the same time have been preserved in the privative derivation. All things considered, the second alternative suggested above would therefore appear rather unlikely.

Let us then consider the first alternative. In the causative it was not unknown that subjunctives of class I existed beside subjunctives of class II (cf. §11.5 above and the present paragraph). In the same manner, there are at least four instances of causative past participles formed to athematic stems beside thematic subjunctives of class II, viz. *tetrikü* ~ *triśä-* to *trik-* (caus.) 'to fail', *p(ēpa)lykü* ~ *pälsä-* to *pälk-* (caus.) 'to make burn, torture', *lyelyūkü* ~ *lyušä-* to *luk-* (caus.) 'to enlighten', *tsetsarkü* ~

tsärsä- to *tsärk-* 'to make burn, torture'. That is to say, in the causatives of the type under discussion here, there are several instances of subjunctive I stems beside the normal subjunctive II stems. There are also several instances of past participle stems in non-palatal athematic finals (actually all the attested stems are in a final *-k-*), even though the accompanying subjunctive stems, to which the participles are supposed to be formed, are exclusively thematic. Neither phenomenon is found among the non-causatives. Therefore, if the non-causative verb *aik-*, in spite of its exclusive subjunctive II formation, produces a privative *anaikätte**, formed to a subjunctive I stem, and, furthermore, also produces a past participle in a non-palatal final, this must be considered highly irregular. One is tempted to reject such a formational pattern outright, and suggest instead that the privative *anaikätte** and the participle *aiku* are formed to the causative of *aik-*, where such a pattern — even though it is not the normal one — is well attested. That is, there is no formal problem in deriving the privative *anaikätte** and the past participle *aiku* from a causative subjunctive I stem **aikā-*. The question is, whether this would be defensible semantically.

With the possible exception of *aiku* (i.e. if this participle is causative), only two, possibly three, forms of the causative of *aik-* are attested. First, there is the preterite IIIb *aiyksātaiy* which occurs in the following context: 214 MQR a2-3 *aiyksātaiy ra saṃsārṣṣana p[o] (lāk)le)nta : cāmpo no ṣaiyt nauwṣai klāwatsi saṃsārmeṃ twe*. Thomas (1957: 174) and K. T. Schmidt (1969: 457) agree in translating *aiyksātaiy* here as a pure causative, i.e. "du hast wissen lassen". This passage, therefore, translates: 'You have also made known all the pains of Saṃsāra, for you were able to report previous (events) from the Saṃsāra'.

Second, there is the form (3pl.) *aiksante*, which occurs in KVāc.

31 b1 *ce po saṃsā(rṣṣi onolmi) /// lacuna /// po śarsa • ce śpā po saṃsārṣṣ[i] onolmi mā aiksante ///*. K. T. Schmidt's (1986: 103) translation of this passage implies that *aiksante* is a non-causative: "Alles, was (die) Saṃsāra(-Wesen zu [ihrer] Erleuchtung brauchten, das) alles wusste er. Und alles, was die Saṃsāra-Wesen nicht wussten, (das alles lehrte er sie)". There may be some formal difficulties with this, however. The non-causative of the verb *aik-* forms a thematic present and subjunctive of class II. All verbs of that pattern form preterites of class I⁷⁰. A non-causative preterite III would be anomalous here. There may be two ways to circumvent this problem. Either one might see *aiksante* as a causative formally but still to be interpreted as a non-causative semantically. Indeed, there is sometimes little or no semantic difference between causatives and non-causatives in Tocharian. Against this alternative it might be pointed out, however, that 214 a2 *aiyksataiy* is decidedly causative semantically, and that it would therefore appear that in the case of the verb *aik-* the causatives and the non-causatives are semantically differentiated. A second alternative would then be to see *aiksante* as a causative – semantically as well as formally – and translate it with 'they have been informed', i.e. '... and everything that the Saṃsāra-beings had not been given to know, (all that he taught them)'.

As for the third conceivable instance of a causative preterite III, 204 Ot b3 *ekasta* (then for **aikasta*), it is to a certain extent ambiguous. K. T. Schmidt (1986: 142) claims that it is definitely a preterite III, and, although he does not say so expressly, he apparently interprets it as a non-causative. The context is as follows: 204 Ot b3 *pernerñesa ekasta enkalñeṣṣem ñemna po*, which Thomas 1957: 170 translates with "Durch [deinen] Glanz hast du alle Namen des Haftens erkannt", clearly

⁷⁰ An exception is the highly irregular *tā-* / *tās-* 'to put'.

interpreting *ekasta* as a non-causative preterite III (cf. Thomas, *l.c.*, n.3: "Sic! Für *aikasta*."). Formally, the same objections apply here as were raised against a non-causative preterite III *aiksante*. Since the Otani text 204 bears no signs of being an MQ-text (except possibly in the form *ekasta*), one is inclined to view *ekasta* as indeed standing for *aikasta* and, therefore, as being a preterite III; a preterite I would have had the form *aikāsta*. But then it must also be translated as a causative which is entirely possible: 'Through your glory you have made known all the names of attachment'.

The past participle occurs four times, as far as I am aware. In 31 Š a4 and a6 we have the sequence *totkāts / totkānts aiku* in a Tocharian translation of Udānavarga XII 12 and 13 (Thomas 1983: 199), rendering the Sanskrit compound *alpajñāta-*. In the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary (Edgerton 1985) this word is translated 'little known, not celebrated', with which the Tocharian phrase *totkāts / totkānts aiku* 'known by few, celebrated by few' agrees perfectly. The question is: do we understand *aiku* as 'known', i.e. a participle to a non-causative (*totkāts / totkānts aiku* 'known by few' or 'known to few'), or do we take it as 'celebrated' in the sense 'who has been made known', i.e. a participle to a causative (*totkāts / totkānts aiku* 'made known to few')? Both interpretations certainly seem possible. Cf. also the remaining two occurrences of *aiku*: 31 Š a8 *mā ranw aiku kārsau ñy akaḷṣle* 'And not the celebrated (and) the famous (is) my disciple' (cf. Sieg / Siegling 1949: 52), 108 S a2 *aikoṣ kārso(ṣ ne)šcer* 'you are the celebrated (and) famous'. That is to say, from a semantic point of view, the participle *aiku* can be interpreted as a non-causative or as a causative. Formally, it can be a causative, whereas a non-causative of that shape would be highly

irregular. The conclusion is very inviting that *aiku* is formed to the causative.

Let us now return to the privative *anaikätte**. As with the participle *aiku*, a derivation of this form from the non-causative is wrought with difficulties, whereas a derivation from the causative subjunctive I stem would be possible. Semantically, however, a causative as well as a non-causative interpretation seems possible in both its occurrences. Thus we have 12 Š a3 ///ñem su wrotse ršāke 18 *anaikte alokālymi puṭk(au)* '... the great rši by name of ... 18 uncelebrated / unknown, completely cut off ...'. In 278 MQ a1 *kete āñme anaiktaimeṃ anaikte ce teyknesa īkene te (= se) spārtoytrā* a causative translation with 'uninformed' or a non-causative with 'unknowing' are equally possible: 'whose spirit, uninformed / unknowing in such a matter, would turn away from the unknown' (for *anaiktaimeṃ* in this passage and *anaiktai* of 386 S b4, see immediately below). That is, there is no semantic reason to reject a derivation of *anaikätte** from the causative subjunctive I stem **aikā-*.

Finally, *anaikätte** is attested only in the form *anaikte*. However, the two texts, where this form is found, are in verse. The syncope of -ā- can easily be seen as metrically conditioned. The initial vocalism has, of course, suffered ā-umlaut.

In addition, a few comments are needed on the form *anaiktai*, an oblique singular attested once in 278 MQ a1 and once extended with the ablative marker *-meṃ* in 386 S b4. Both texts are metrical, so that this form may well stand for *anaikāttai** with metrical syncope. The oblique *anaiktai* cannot be seen as a feminine singular of the privative adjective, in which case one would have expected a palatalized suffixal consonantism (°caī). Rather, the oblique *anaiktai* indicates a nominative singular *anaikto** (*anaikätto**) 'that which is unknown, that which has not been

made known'. It seems quite evident that *anaikto** must be a derivate of the privative *anaikätte** 'not celebrated, not (made) known'.

§12.6. Sixth, the privative *ekamätte* 'which has not come, future' is well attested⁷¹. The derivation from the verb *kām-* 'to come' is obvious. The determination of the precise verbal stem that underlies this privative is less straightforward but by no means impossible.

As indicated on the list above (§12), the verb *kām-* forms a thematic subjunctive of class II with a palatalized initial consonant, viz. *šāmǎ-*, cf. e.g. 1 Š b5 *šman-me*. Clearly, this subjunctive stem cannot have produced the derivative *ekamätte* with a non-palatal root initial. The most common preterite to this verb is of class VI, showing a unique thematic ablauting stem, cf. 1st sg. *kamau*, 3rd sg. *šem*. This stem appears to have been accentuated on the thematic vowel as would be expected, cf. H 149. 234 b1 *šema-ñ* 'he came to me', 22 Š b5/6 *kmeṃ-ne* 'they came to them'. Even assuming one could deduct a preterital stem ***kāmǎ-* from these forms, which is — to say the least — extremely doubtful, it would be unnatural to derive *ekamätte* from such a preterite stem in the face of the derivation of all other privatives from subjunctive stems. Besides, in accordance with our theory here, an underlying ***kāmǎ-* would have produced a privative with a preserved prefixal nasal. That is, neither the attested subjunctive II stem nor the preterite VI stem of *kām-* could have produced *ekamätte*.

This does not exhaust the possibilities, however. Beside the more frequent preterite VI, the verb *kām-* also forms a preterite of class III. This preterite is clearly accentuated on the root syllable, i.e. *kām-s-*, cf. 380 Š a6 *kamtsante* 'they came', H 149. 15 a2 *kamtsatai* 'you came'. It was

⁷¹ 27 Š a3, 221 MQR b5, 284 MQ b4, H 149. 38 a5, PK AS 16. 2 b5, Dd 6/2.2, Dd 6/2.3 (Pinault 1987: 184). Quite uncertain is the emendation of H add. 149. 92 b6 *ek mak[t]e to ekmatte*, suggested by Broomhead 1962a: 254.

indicated above (§10) that preterites of class III often accompanied subjunctives of class I and that if these subjunctives had ablaut they, as well as the preterite III, had initial accent. Even though no subjunctive I is attested that would correspond to the preterite III *kām-s-*, it would not be a very hazardous guess to assume that it did at some time exist. That is, it might be suggested that there was a subjunctive I stem **kāmā-*, possibly ablauting with **śāmā-* or **kémā-*, on a par with e.g. the ablauting subjunctive I stems *kālā-* and *kélā-* accompanied by the preterite III *kél-s-*, as described above (§12.2). Such a stem would agree with the privative *ekamätte*, whose lack of a prefixal nasal would also receive its explanation. Furthermore, a confirmation of the subjunctive I stem might be seen in the past participle *kekamu*. A participle of this shape is regular with preterites of class III (Krause / Thomas 1960: 249, n. 1), and derives from a subjunctive I stem, cf. discussion of *aiku* above.

§12.7. Before we turn to the next group, the seventh privative of Group IIb must be commented upon. This is *airpätte** / *airpitte**, deriving from the verb *yārp-* ‘to heed, observe’ that forms a preterite of class III as the other verbs behind this group of privatives, but unlike them forms a subjunctive II.

The meaning of *airpätte** is given by Krause 1952: 42 as ‘ungeachtet’ (cf. also Van Windekens 1976: 593 ‘non considéré’, K. T. Schmidt 1980: 405 ‘unbeachtet(?)’) on the basis of the meaning of the verb *yārp-*. The occurrences of this word, as known to Krause, might point to such a meaning — an active rather than a passive one — but they cannot be considered as conclusive. This seems quite plausible especially in the text 541 D a6 ///b[u]ddhiviṣaya • *airpācce pañāktāṃñe ai(śamñe)* ‘the unheeding Buddha-wisdom’, and is perhaps also possible in 240 MQ b5

(ai)rpätt=oko 'the unheeding fruit' or 'the fruit of disconcern', whereas the context of 571 MQR a4 *airpättona* is inscrutable.

In a Buddhist ritualtext in West Tocharian (KVāc.), recently edited by K. T. Schmidt (1986), this privative is found once in the line 12 b4 (*wāsa*)*nma ausormem snai-y(parw)e (sa)m(s)ā[r](n)e [ai]rpittona läklenta wärpātai*, which K. T. Schmidt (op. cit., p. 75) translates: "Durch das Tragen (derartigen Gewänd)er erduldest du im anfanglosen Samsāra unvorstellbare Leiden", and he remarks (p. 76, n. 5, and p. 130) that *airpitte** is not to be seen as formed to the verb *yärp-* as hitherto assumed, but to the verb *wärp-* 'to enjoy, sense'; he therefore suggests that it be translated "(wtl.) unerdulbar". K. T. Schmidt's translation here fits well in this particular context, but so would the translation 'unheeding, disregarding', for in Buddhist thought the pains of Samsāra take no account of anything, they are blind and unheeding. There is thus no compelling semantic reason to give up the connection of *airpätte** with *yärp-* in favour of *wärp-*. Actually, there is a formal criterion that decides the issue here, for the verb *wärp-* forms the following stems: present VI *wärpnā-*, subjunctive V *wärpā-*, preterite Iañ *wärpā-* (past participle *wärpau*). None of these stems could have produced a derivate privative in *-ätte / -itte*. And, furthermore, none of these stems has root initial palatalization, which would be needed to form a privative beginning with *airp-*. K. T. Schmidt's proposal can therefore be decisively rejected.

Pinault's recent publication (1989) of two important Paris texts revealed three further occurrences of our privative, i.e. PK AS 16.2 b3 *airpēcce śaul ś(aitsi)* "vivre une vie d'ataraxie" (Pinault, p. 196), PK AS 16.3 b4 [*wno*](*lmi klautk*)*āre ot airpēcce śaul[n]e* "les humains se (tourn)èrent vers une vie d'ataraxie" (Pinault, p. 197), PK AS 16.2 a6 *śau(l śawśante airpēc)c(e)* "ils (vécurent) une vie d'ataraxie" (Pinault, p.

196). Here, *airpätte**, according to Pinault (p. 166) appears to be the equivalent of Skt. *alpotsuka-* 'unconcerned, impassive'. Clearly these occurrences confirm Krause's translation and the derivation from the verb *yärp-*.

The verb *yärp-*, apparently, is not attested in the present tense. However, there is a present derivate *yirpşuki* 'inspector' (Krause & Thomas 1960: 189)⁷², which is clearly formed to a present of class VIII. Furthermore, there is a preterite IIIaß *yerpsa*, but the subjunctive stem is either of class I or II, witness e.g. the gerundive *y[ä]r[p]alle* (119 MQR b4), *yärpällesa* (PK 12 B b3). Non-causatives of present class VIII and preterite III are regularly accompanied by subjunctives of class I (cf. Krause 1952: 77-78). This is so in the case of nine verbs out of twelve, whereas two verbs are not attested in the subjunctive. Only one verb has subjunctive II beside present VIII and preterite III. One would then expect *yärp-* to have formed subjunctive of class I. This would have been no problem, if the privative only had the form *airpätte**. One would then have suggested a subjunctive I stem *yärpä-*. However, in view of KVāc. 12 b4 *airpitte** it seems necessary to assume that *yärp-* formed a thematic subjunctive II stem *yärpä-*, for the *-i-* for *-ä-* in *airpitte* is most plausibly explained as reflecting the (previous) palatal quality of the preceding *-p-*, cf. B *piś* 'five' < **penk^ue*. As indicated above, there is one verb that forms present VIII and preterite III accompanied by a subjunctive of class II. This is *şärp-* 'to indicate, show'. It seems possible that the verbal stem pattern of *yärp-* was the same as that of *şärp-*. If so, the form *airpitte** beside *airpätte** is understandable, for the suffixal *-ä-* of subjunctive II

⁷² According to Krause (1952: 46 and 275) B *yirpşuki* is found in MAB 216 (the code is unfamiliar to me: perhaps Manuskript der Akademie Berlin?) and is "Titel eines Klosterbeamten, etwa 'Inspektor'".

reflects the thematic (and palatalizing) vowel (I.-E.) *-e-. The initial syllable *airp-* reflects earlier B **eyärp-* < Common Toch. **æñ-yärp-*.

Privatives in Common Tocharian -ättæ Group IIc

§13. In Group IIc we have to deal with two further privatives formed to thematic subjunctive II stems. Unlike *airpätte*/airpitte**, however, whose underlying subjunctive II stem is accompanied by a preterite of class III, the privatives *apāššätte* and *enklyaušätte** are formed to subjunctive II stems accompanied by preterites of class I.

Group IIc privative	pres.	subj.	pret.	past ptc.
<i>apāššätte</i>	<i>pāššá-</i> II	<i>pāššá-</i> II	<i>pāššá-</i> Ibα	<i>papāššu</i>
<i>enklyaušätte</i>	<i>klyaušá-</i> II	<i>klyaušá-</i> II	<i>klyaušá-</i> Ibα	<i>keklyaušu</i>

In view of the apparently identical verbal stem patterns of the verbs *pāsk-* 'to guard' and *klyaus-* 'to hear' to which *apāššätte* and *enklyaušätte** are formed, the loss of the prefixal nasal in the one privative as against its retention in the other would seem paradoxical. However, a solution to this problem is possible that would harmonize with the conditions regulating these phenomena as proposed above.

§13.1. First, *enklyaušätte** 'unheard (of)', to the verb *klyaus-* 'to hear', is attested three times, e.g. *[kūs]e pelaiknešše krent ceu yerkwantai enklyaušácce nauš • spyārta ...* 'who turned the good, previously unheard of, dharma-wheel ...'; furthermore 30 Š b8, 127 MQR b4-5.

The derivation of this privative from the subjunctive II stem

klyauṣä- is unproblematic, for this stem form clearly fits that of *eñklyauṣätte**. Furthermore, in view of the fact that the thematic vowel in its pure form (i.e. when not combined with certain other suffixes, cf. below) always carries the accent in West Tocharian (Marggraf 1970: 22), so that the subjunctive II stem was ascertainably *klyauṣǎ́*, the retention of the prefixal nasal of *eñklyauṣätte** is expected in accordance with the theory proposed above. — Note that the lack of *ā*-umlaut in the initial syllable is quite regular, for the diphthong of the root syllable reflects a Common Toch. **-æu-* not **-āu-*, as seen by such occasional MQ-forms as e.g. 133 MQR a7 *klye_uṣälle*.

§13.2. Second, *apāṣṣätte* 'not observing (the rules of moral conduct)', to the verb *pāsk-* 'to guard, observe' is attested five times, e.g. 31 Š a2 *mant sw apāṣṣätte kälpaucā śwātsi yoktsi alanmēm ṣaṇ ka kātsa lkāntār* '... so [thinks] the unobserving (i.e. one who does not observe the rules of correct conduct) attainer of food and drink from elsewhere, when they only look at (i.e. heed) their own belly ...'; furthermore 19 MQ b5, 31 Š b2, 32 Š a4, 522 Š a2.

The derivation of *apāṣṣätte* from the subjunctive II stem *pāṣṣǎ́-* is formally in order, except that it would contradict our theory about the prefixal nasal. If the subjunctive stem had suffixal accentuation the privative ought to have retained the nasal.

Now, there is no denying that the synchronic subjunctive II stem to *pāsk-* was *pāṣṣǎ́-* with accent on the suffixal syllable, cf. e.g. the gerundive *paṣṣalle* of 14 Š a5, 23 Š a2, 67 Š b5, etc. However, it can be argued that this may be a secondary state of affairs and that the stem *pāṣṣǎ́-* may have replaced an earlier **pǎṣṣä-* which would agree with the loss of the prefixal nasal of *apāṣṣätte*.

§13.2.1. As already indicated (§5), Marggraf 1970: 22-23

observes that the (ablauting) thematic vowel is always accentuated in West Tocharian, except when found in combination with certain other suffixes; that is, the thematic vowel of the suffixes *-ššä-/ske-* and *-ññä-/ññe-* never carries the accent.

The *-ššä-/ske-* suffix is very frequent in Tocharian. It has several functions. First, in non-causatives it can be a present stem formative, in which case it is not found in non-present stems, e.g. *eñk-* 'to seize' with present IX *eñkäššä-*, but subjunctive I *eñkä-* and preterite III *eñk-s-*. Second, it is the marker of the causative presents of class IX (and in combination with a preceding *-n-* or *-s-* it marks the causatives of classes X and XI) and it is usually found in the accompanying subjunctive stem also and even sometimes in the preterite stem. Characteristically, causatives of class IX accentuate the initial syllable (e.g. *tanmäššäm* 'gives birth') as against the presuffixal accentuation of the non-causatives (e.g. *tänmastär* 'is born'). Third, in several non-causative verbs the element *-sk-* is found in all stems of the verb and can therefore, from a synchronic point of view, be considered radical.

The *sk-*verbs of the third kind can be divided into two main groups. The first contains four verbs with bisyllabic root structures, i.e. *ālāsk-* 'to be sick', *ānāsk-* 'to inhale', *sātāsk-* 'to exhale', *wināsk-* 'to honour'. Krause's classification of *eñāsk-* 'to instruct' with these verbs (1952: 86) is mistaken, for *eñāsk-* is actually — in historical terms — the causative to *eñk-* 'to grasp' (cf. Hilmarsson 1987b) and — unlike the four verbs of the group — has the characteristic initial syllable accentuation of the causatives.

These four verbs form presents of class IX, subjunctives IX, and preterites IV. In all instances they accentuate the vowel preceding the *sk-*element; viz.

verb	pres.	subj.	pret.
<i>ālāsk-</i>	<i>ālāṣṣä- IX</i>	<i>ālāṣṣä- IX</i>	unattested
<i>ānāsk-</i>	<i>ānāṣṣä- IX</i>	unattested	unattested
<i>sātāsk-</i>	<i>sātāṣṣä- IX</i>	<i>sātāṣṣä- IX</i>	unattested
<i>wināsk-</i>	<i>wināṣṣä- IX</i>	<i>wināṣṣä- IX</i>	<i>wināṣṣä- IV</i>

In words of this structure it is, of course, predictable that the final suffixal vocalism would not carry the accent.

§13.2.2. A second group contains verbs with monosyllabic root structures. The way they form their various verbal stems is not homogeneous.

Three verbs form presents of class II, subjunctives II, and preterites I; viz.

verb	pres.	subj.	pret.
<i>ñāsk-</i> 'to demand'	<i>ñāṣṣä- II</i>	<i>ñāṣṣä- II</i>	<i>ñāṣṣä- I</i>
<i>nāsk-</i> 'to bathe'	<i>nāṣṣä- II</i>	<i>nāṣṣä- II</i>	<i>nāṣṣä- I</i>
<i>pāsk-</i> 'to guard'	<i>pāṣṣä- II</i>	<i>pāṣṣä- II</i>	<i>pāṣṣä- I</i>

One verb forms a present of class IX, subjunctive II, and preterite I; viz.

<i>yāsk-</i> 'to beg'	<i>yāskāṣṣä- IX</i>	<i>yāṣṣä- II</i>	<i>yāṣṣä- I</i>
-----------------------	---------------------	------------------	-----------------

Two verbs form presents of class XII, subjunctive V, and preterite I; viz.

verb	pres.	subj.	pret.
<i>kāsk-</i> 'to spread'	<i>kāskāññä- XII</i>	<i>kāskā- V</i> <i>kāskä- V</i>	<i>kāskä- I</i>
<i>wāsk-</i> 'to move'	<i>wä/āskāññä- XII</i>	unattested	<i>wāskä- I</i>

Two verbs form presents of class II, subjunctives V, preterites unattested; viz.

<i>tresk-</i> 'to chew'	<i>treṣṣä-</i> II	<i>trāskā-</i> V	unattested
<i>nesk-</i> 'to eat'(?)	unattested	<i>nāskā-</i> V	unattested

For *nesk-*, which is not listed in the general handbooks, cf. Adams 1989: 5-7. Judging by the East Tocharian past participle *tāträsku* (if correctly emended by Sieg & Siegling & Schulze 1931: 441), the verb *tresk-* formed a preterite of class I *trāskā̃-*.

Finally, there are the verbs *ārsk-* 'to end' and *wärsk-* 'to smell'. The stem formations of *ārsk-* are unclear, for here the past participle *ārskoṣ* and its derivate *ārskormem* are the only forms attested. Krause 1952: 168 suggests a preterite of class I *ārskā̃-*. In *wärsk-* the status of *-sk-* is somewhat ambiguous. On the one hand, in view of the intransitive infinitive *wrätsi*, it can be interpreted as suffixal. On the other hand, the transitive infinitive *warstsi* and the transitive preterite I *wärskā̃-* indicate a radical *-sk-*. Apparently, there was a double paradigm here, an intransitive one, viz. present II *wärṣṣä-* ~ subjunctive *wärä̃-* ~ preterite unattested, and a transitive one, viz. present II *wärṣṣä-* ~ subjunctive I (or II?) *wärskā-* (or *wärṣṣä-*?) ~ preterite I *wärskā̃-*.

The diversity of these formations is not as great as it may seem, for it can be reduced to two subgroups. On the one hand there is subgroup (a) with verbs that form subjunctives of class II accompanied by preterites of class I (*nāsk-*, *nāsk-*, *pāsk-*, *yāsk-*), whereas on the other hand there is subgroup (b) with verbs that form subjunctives of class V accompanied by preterites of class I (*kāsk-*, *wāsk-*, *tresk-*, probably *ārsk-*, and possibly *nesk-*). In subgroup (a) the present formation is of

class II and in one instance of class IX. However, this one present IX (*yāskāššä-*) has a double *-sk-*, a radical and a suffixal one, and it would seem likely here that an original present II **yāššä-* / **yāské-* has been transformed into a present of class IX, which would make all the verbs of subgroup (a) identical in their verbal stem formations. Similarly in subgroup (b), it seems likely that the present II formation of *tresk-* (and *nesk-*?) is original and that the present XII formation of *kāsk-* and *wāsk-* is secondary. But *wārisk-* (transitive) takes an intermediate position with its present II accompanied by subjunctive I or II (as if subgroup (a)) and preterite I in a non-palatal root final (as if subgroup (b)).

§13.2.3. In Indo-European, the suffix **-ske/o-* was a present stem formative, which only secondarily (and probably separately in the individual languages) could be generalized in non-present formations, cf. Skt. (pres.) *gacchati* vs. (aor. subj.) *agamat*, Lat. (pres.) *pāscō* vs. (perf.) *pāvī*, etc. The original state of affairs is partly preserved in Tocharian, for here, as pointed out above, non-causatives of present class IX are characterized by the element *-ššä-/ske-* that is not found in the accompanying subjunctive and preterite stems. The causatives of class IX have secondarily extended the *-ššä-/ske-* suffix to their subjunctive and even to their preterite stems, which is probably to be ascribed to the fact that this suffix had become productive as a causative marker in Tocharian.

There are signs that non-causatives with generalized *-ššä-/ske-* have not always had this suffix in their non-present stems. Thus, while the verb *wārisk-* 'to smell' undoubtedly has a generalized *sk-* suffix in all its stem forms when used in a transitive sense, the intransitive infinitive *wrātsi* (Lévi K 8 b3) clearly has no such suffix. Furthermore, the verb *ñāsk-* 'to request', which has an *sk-* suffix attested in the preterite (Iaß

ñāṣṣa), forms a deverbative substantive *ñās* / *ñyās* 'demand', whose lack of *sk*-suffix agrees with the once attested preterite *ñāssare* (331 S a5). It seems necessary to classify *ñāssare* as a preterite of class II (termed by Krause [1952: 174sq.] "the strong causative preterite") instead of taking it as an erroneous preterite Iaß (for **ñāṣṣāre*) as this would involve — in my opinion — an unacceptably great number of mistakes on the part of the scribe. Such an interpretation of the form *ñāssare* does not necessarily imply that it must be translated as a pure causative; many verbs make no or very little semantic distinction between their causative and non-causative stems.

That is to say, even among those verbs that appear to have generalized the *-sk-* suffix in all their stem forms, there are traces of forms without this suffix. This fact, combined with the Indo-European evidence and with the limitation of the *-sk-* suffix to the present stem in most non-causative Tocharian verbs that exhibit it, suggests that verbs with *-sk-* suffix in all their stem forms have generalized the *-sk-* in the course of Tocharian history, even perhaps in some cases as late as in West Tocharian times. That is, the *-sk-* formations of the subjunctive and the preterite have replaced some earlier formations.

It seems natural that the answer to the question what these earlier formations may have been should be sought among the non-causatives of present class IX (*-ṣṣā/-ske-* presents) and perhaps even present class VIII (*-ṣā/-se-* presents). In an overwhelming majority of cases verbs of these classes form subjunctives of class I and preterites of class III. It might then be suggested that the verbs that have generalized the *-sk-* suffix in all their stems previously formed subjunctives of class I as well, unless, of course, their root final preceding the *-sk-* suffix was *-ā-*, in which case their subjunctive could be interpreted as of class V.

Thus, for instance, the verb *wināsk-* 'to honour' may have formed to the present IX *wināššä-* an athematic subjunctive ***winā-*, which could be taken as of class V rather than I. The verb *pāsk-*, on the other hand, with the present *pāššä-* (which then would have to be interpreted as present IX), would have formed the subjunctive ***pā-*, which would probably have been taken as subjunctive I rather than V, for subjunctives of class V are never monosyllabic.

Now, at that time, when the *-sk-* element had still not been generalized, the present form *pāššä-* was not a present of class II but of class IX. The presents of class IX never accentuated the thematic vowel. This statement is, of course, not necessarily corroborated by forms like *wināššä-* or causative forms like *klútkäššä-*, for here it is predictable that the accent would not fall on the thematic vowel. Rather, it is proven by the present IX verbs of monosyllabic root structure, such as *ai-* 'to give' and *we-* 'to speak' that form the gerundives *aišle* (492 MQ a2, b1; prose), i.e. *áiššälle**, and *wéššälle* (18 Š b3, and frequently in the KVāc., cf. K. T. Schmidt 1986), cf. also 3sg. *wéšan-nešcä* (85 Š a2) [not **weš(š)án-nešcä*], etc., etc. Originally, the present IX to *pāsk-* would thus have been **pāššä-* and not *pāššä-*. As a result of the generalization of the *-sk-* element in a few verbs, the athematic subjunctive **pā-* was replaced by *pāššä-*. Since no *-sk-* formations at that time accentuated the thematic vowel, this subjunctive must have been **pāššä-* and not *pāššä-*. If one projects the formation of the privative *apāššätte* to this stage in the development of Tocharian, the loss of the nasal of the prefix receives its explanation in accordance with my theory here: the nasal is lost if the basic word accentuates the first syllable. Of course, in the case of this particular privative, it may be seen as quite *ad hoc* to assume that it was formed when the subjunctive still had initial accent. That cannot be

proven by independent evidence. However, independent testimony has been brought forth that indicated a stage in Tocharian history, when verbs that had generalized an *-sk-* element in all their stems formed subjunctives of the type **pāššä-*; I only contend that this provided the circumstances that could have produced the privative *apāššätte* rather than ***ampāššätte* in accordance with my thesis. — The replacement of the present and subjunctive IX **pāššä-* by present and subjunctive II *pāššä-* may have taken place soon after the generalization of the *-sk-* element. This generalization entailed a new interpretation of the verbs affected. The *-sk-* had become a part of the root and was no longer seen as suffixal. These verbs had become simple thematic verbs and their present / subjunctive IX formation was understood as a present / subjunctive II formation. Such formations always accentuate the thematic vowel; therefore **pāššä-* was changed to *pāššä-*.

A privative of uncertain formation

§14. Finally, for the sake of completeness, a last West Tocharian privative might be mentioned. Its verbal base as well as its precise meaning is unknown, however.

B *aiskacu* is a *hapax legomenon* found in 208 MQR a4. The text is fragmentary: *///(na)[na]korsa aiskacu ci wī(naskau)*, and any translation is hazardous. Formally, it is clear though that *aiskacu* is a vocative singular masculine, in all probability, to a privative B *aiskatte** (or less likely to *aiskätte**). An appropriate verb is lacking in West Tocharian, but one might posit a subjunctive V **yāskā-* (from Common Toch. **yāskā-* or **w'āskā-*), while a subjunctive I **yāskā-* (from

Common Toch. **yäskä-* or **w'äskä-*) would be extremely unlikely.⁷³ In East Tocharian the form 452 a4 *w-wäsku* could belong with B *aiskacu*, but its meaning is unknown. – B *aiskacu*, if to a verbal **yäskā-*, implies an intermediate **eyäskätte* < **æñ-yäskättæ* or **æñ-w'äskättæ*.

Denominative formations: Introduction

§15. We now turn our attention to the non-deverbative prefixed formations, i.e. denominative formations containing the local or the negative nasal prefixes. These will be sorted and discussed according to their prefixal vocalisms; at the end of that presentation consideration will be given to the question whether their loss or retention of the prefixal nasal is in harmony with the conclusions reached in the case of the deverbative privatives.

Formations in prefixal **ā(N)-*

§16. As already indicated or implied several times in this study, Common Toch. **æN-* suffers umlaut to **āN-* before an **-ā-* of the following radical syllable. That **-ā-*, in turn, can be either an original Common Toch. **-ā-*, or it can be an umlauted vocalism itself. Common Toch. **āN-* thereupon results in B *a(N)-* (reduction of **ā* to *a* in unaccented position), A *ā(N)-*. Examples:

§16.1. The local prefix:

§16.1.1. B *akartte* (109 S b7, 330 S b4), beside *akarte* (46 Š b4) and *akärtte* (Sieg / Siegling 1949: 87), an adverb with the meaning

⁷³ A thematic subjunctive II in *-sk-/-šš-* would produce a privative in *-ššätte*, cf. *apāššätte*.

'nearby, close to, (Skt.) *saṃīpe*' has repeatedly been analysed by Van Windekens (1974: 141, 1976: 141, 1979: 93) as formed with what he terms "the intensive prefix *a-*" plus **-kart(t)e*, a cognate of Lith. *gretà* 'beside', etc. This analysis has met with approval by Ivanov (1988: 57) and even Thomas (1985: 138). However, this is phonologically impossible. The prefix — whether one terms it an "intensive" or "local" prefix — ought to have resulted in a West Tocharian *e(n)-*, and no *ā*-umlaut could have taken place in this word, for the *-a-* of the following syllable reflects an accentuated *-ǎ-* as proven by the form *akärtte* cited by Sieg & Siegling (*loc. cit.*). Conceivably, it might be possible to save Van Windekens' etymology by proposing that the prefix is not the Common Toch. **æn-* that is under discussion in this study, but rather a Common Toch. **ā-* from I.-E. **ō-*. Such a solution is not without complications, however, for further examples of that prefix in Tocharian are doubtful, and, moreover, it raises the question of the development of I.-E. **ō* in Tocharian which has not yet been definitively settled. That is to say, B *akartte*, etc., cannot reflect an I.-E. **H₂g₁to-* or **H₂greto-*; an I.-E. **ōg₁to-* or **ōgreto-* might be possible, but further discussion of that would lead us beyond the scope of this paper.

§16.1.2. B *amāskai* (adv.) 'with difficulty, heavily' is of frequent occurrence, e.g. 14 Š b8, 44 Š b1, etc. It is formed to an underlying B **māsko*, an unattested derivative of B *māskw* 'heaviness'⁷⁴, and clearly reflects an earlier prepositional phrase **æn + *māskai* (obl. sg.) '(lit.) in heaviness (*vel sim.*)'. An identical formation is not found in East Tocharian, for here B *amāskai* is matched by A *māski* (adj./adv.) 'difficult; with difficulty'. The use of a prefixed formation in West

⁷⁴ B *māskw* is to be posited thus as seen by e.g. 127 MQR b2 *māskune* (loc.sg.), etc.; the *māskwo* 'Hindernis' of the handbooks is found only in 45 Š b4 *mās[k]wo* and has a "mobile" -o.

Tocharian as against a non-prefixed one in East Tocharian is found in other cases as well, cf. e.g. B *aṣkār* 'back' vs. A *ṣkāṛā* 'id.'.

§16.1.3. B *anaśai* (adv.) 'exactly, diligently' is of frequent occurrence. It is clearly formed as a prepositional phrase **æn + *aśai* '(lit.) in knowledge' to *aśai* (oblique singular to an unattested nominative **aśo*) as found in the phrase *aśai* (A *eśe*) *yām-* 'to take notice of'. The noun **aśo* derives from the verb *aik-* 'to know' from Common Toch. **aik-* < I.-E. **H₂eik-* and thus has an inherent Tocharian *ā*-vocalism in the root that caused *ā*-umlaut in the prefix.

§16.1.4. B *anāsk-* (i.e. **ānāsk-*) 'to breathe in'. Although we are not in this verb confronted with a denominative formation, it will be treated here. It has been derived – obviously correctly – from the Indo-European root **H₂enH₁-* 'to breathe', but has in my opinion been incorrectly analysed as reflecting a simple **H₂enH₁-sk-e/o-* (with vocalization of the internal **-H₁-*). This analysis does not take account of the fact that B **ānāsk-* 'inhale' forms a pair with B **sātāsk-* 'to exhale' in a similar manner as we find in Latin *inhalare* ~ *exhalare*. I submit that these Tocharian verbs are prefixed with "in" in **ānāsk-* and "away from oneself" in **sātāsk-*. The verbal root itself, as befits a formation in suffixal **-sk-*, was in the zero grade. That is, pre-Toch. **H₂en-H₂pH₁-sk-* resulted in Proto-Toch. **æn-ānsk-* (with loss of the laryngeal in the sequence **-pH₁-*, cf. B *parwe* 'firstly' < **p_lH₃u-*, while the root initial laryngeal was vocalized because of the development of the preceding **H₂p-* in initial position to **æn-*) > B **ānāsk-* (through *ā*-umlaut, and loss of the nasal before *-sk-*, cf. AB *māsk-* 'to be' < **mānsk-* < **mp(H₁)-sk-*). In the same manner pre-Toch. **sūōd-H₂pH₁-sk-* yielded Proto-Toch. **sāt-ānsk-* > B **sātāsk-* (for the change of initial **sū-* to Toch. *s-*, see discussion under B *aswāre*, §16.2.3).

§16.1.5. A *āneñci*, *āneṃśi* (adv.) 'well, exactly' is well attested, e.g. 354 a5 *āneñci kākropu* = Skt. *susamvṛta*. It is unclear in its formation, but may conceivably contain the local prefix followed by a derivate of A *ānt*, B *ānte* 'surface, front', i.e. Common Toch. **æn* + **āñciyæ* (vel *sim.*), which after the operation of *ā*-umlaut developed an epenthetic *-i-* in East Tocharian yielding A **ānāⁱñciya* and finally A *āneñci*. Semantically, this would be acceptable, if one assumes that **āñciyæ* had the meaning 'end, utmost point' or the like, cf. OIcel. *enni* 'front of the head', *endi* 'utmost point', etc.

§16.1.6. B *aṅkaiṃ* (adv.) 'wrongly, falsely' (lit. 'in the wrong') is well attested, e.g. 15 Š a5. It reflects an earlier prepositional phrase **æn* + **kāiṃ*-, cf. A *keṃ* (adj.) 'wrong, false'. The etymology of this word is unclear, but the umlauted prefixal vocalism shows that the diphthong of the root is **-āi-* and not **-æi-*. Furthermore, even though *aṅkaiṃ* is only disyllabic, the initial *a-* (not *ā-*) shows that it was accented on the second syllable. This has consequences for the etymological evaluation of this word (and A *keṃ*) as well as for the question of the retention of the prefixal nasal. I suggest that *aṅkaiṃ* is cognate with OIr. *gáu*, *gáo*, *gó* 'lie' (*gú-forcell* 'false witness'), MW *geu*, ModW *gau* 'false; lie', Bret. *gaou* 'id.'. These forms, apparently, reflect Celtic **gāyā*. Assuming that a corresponding form, extended with a suffixal **-īn-*, is the basis of the Tocharian forms, one can reach B *-kaiṃ*, A *keṃ* from **kāwā-in-* in the same manner as one has B *kauṃ*, A *koṃ* 'day, sun' from **kāyæ-un-*, cf. §19.6. That is to say, a syllable has been lost through contraction in B *-kaiṃ*, A *keṃ*, and the retention of the nasal in B *aṅkaiṃ* can be seen in connection with non-initial accent in the form underlying *-kaiṃ*.

§16.1.7. B *apākārtse* (adv.) 'clearly, openly' (lit. 'in the open') is

found several times; in all attested instances it is in collocation with the verbs *yām-* 'to do, make', i.e. then 'to reveal, make known' (30 Š a4, H 149. add. 19 b3, H 149. add. 42 a3), and *länt-* 'to leave, go out', i.e. then 'to leave openly, reveal oneself' (94 Š b6, 350 MQR a5). A matching prefixed formation is not found in East Tocharian, but non-prefixed A *pākär yām-* 'to reveal, make known' and *pākär länt-* 'to reveal oneself, leave openly' clearly correspond to the prefixed B *apākärtse yām-* and *apākärtse länt-* respectively, cf. B *amāskai, aškär* vs. A *māski, škārā* for that type of correspondences. B *apākärtse* is originally an adjectival formation to an **āpākär*, which in turn reflects an earlier prepositional phrase **æn + *pākrä*. The word-formational relationship of the underlying **pākrä* to the adverb B *pākri* 'clear, open' (A *pākär* 'id.') is not quite clear (but cf. the etymological note at the end of this paragraph). To B *pākri* one might have expected a prefixed **āpākri* which indeed may be attested in the form H add. 149. 71 b3 *apākri*; since there is virtually no context here, this cannot be definitely determined though. – Furthermore, in 69 Š a2 *oşle pākre klain[ām]pa kca trensate* it seems conceivable that one should recover a further prefixed formation *apākre**. This line is translated by Sieg & Siegling 1949: 80 with "... abends und morgens (?) hängte er sich an eine Frau"; the translation "morgens (?) " indicates that Sieg & Siegling assumed *pākre* is to be associated with B *pākri* 'clear, evident'. While this association may be accepted, it seems better to interpret *oşle pākre* as *oşle=pākre*, i.e. a *sandhi* for *oşle apākre*, whereby *apākre** could be understood as 'in the open'; the whole phrase would then be translated with 'in secret [and] in the open he clung to a certain woman', cf. discussion of *oşle* in §17.1.14sq. – Etymologically, B *pākri*, A *pākär* is probably correctly associated with Skt. *pajrā-* '± solid' (Van Windekens 1976: 350) although

the correspondence cannot be morphologically exact. A stem in *-ro-* may be found in A *pākraši* adv. ‘= *pākār*’ and possibly in B *apākre** (or *pākre*), whereas it seems likely that A *pākār* equals B *pākri* and therefore reflects something else than a stem in *-ro-*. While the *-i* of B *pākri* does not reflect an I.-E. **-i(-)* directly, it could be a reflex of some *i*-stem case form; one might thus suggest that B *pākri*, A *pākār*, as well as the prefixed B *apākārtse* derive from a Proto-Tocharian *i*-stem **pākri-*. An equivalent formation could be found in Italic, cf. Umbr. *pacer* ‘propitius’ (nom. pl. *pacrer*), Marr. *pacre* ‘propitium’, Pelign. *pacris* ‘pācātī’⁷⁵. This would indicate an Indo-European (Western Indo-European?) **pakri-* underlying the Tocharian and Italic words.

§16.1.8. B *aplāc* (adv.) ‘in conversation’ is attested at 3 Š a5 *šamyem māka šamāni aplāc* ‘many monks were sitting in conversation’. It clearly represents an earlier prepositional phrase **æn + *plācā* with the oblique singular of B *plāce* [A *plāc*] ‘speech’.

§16.1.9. B *aśāwe* adj. ‘coarse, gross’ is attested a few times, e.g. 7 Š a7. It is matched by A *āśāwe* ‘id.’. The etymology is uncertain (cf. Van Windekens 1976: 170 with lit.) and it is therefore difficult to assess whether these words are prefixed formations or not. The following might perhaps be suggested. A *āśāwe* is not a borrowing from West Tocharian, but formed to the stem of the word A *śāwe* current in East Tocharian as the suppletive plural of *tsopats* ‘big’. B *aśāwe* might then be borrowed from East Tocharian, but could also be seen as an indigenous West Tocharian form. Common Toch. **āśāwV(-)* underlying B *aśāwe*, A *āśāwe* could reflect earlier **æn + śāwV(-)*, a prepositional phrase meaning ‘in a gross [manner]’, *vel sim.*, that later came to serve as an adjective ‘gross, coarse’.

⁷⁵ Possibly also Old Lat. (Duenos inscription) *PACARI*.

§16.1.10. B *aškār* (adv.) 'back; again' is frequently attested, e.g. 238 MQ b2. It is matched in East Tocharian by a non-prefixed *škārā* (a perlocative form). B *aškār* reflects an adverbialized prepositional phrase **æn + *škārā* (or possibly **æn + *šākārā* ?) 'in return' (*vel sim.*). The unlauded prefix vocalism seems to exclude the possibility that *-šk-* could reflect an earlier **-šVk-* which would have enabled an etymological association with the verb B *sik-* 'to place the foot' (B *šiko* 'step'). While this verb has introduced a morphological zero grade replacement in the present (3sg.) *siknam* along with a generalized non-palatal initial as always in the nasal presents, B *aškār*, A *škārā* (if related to this verb) have preserved the old zero grade as well as the regularly palatalized initial, i.e. **škār < *šākārā < *I.-E. sik-*.

§16.1.11. B *aulāre* m. 'companion' is attested a few times, e.g. 255 MQ b7. It is matched by A *olar* 'id.'. Its etymology has not been determined with certainty, cf. Van Windekens 1976: 333 with lit. I submit that it is to be associated within Tocharian with B *lāre* adj. 'dear, beloved'. This latter word I derive from I.-E. **ulH-ro-*, an adjectival *ro*-derivative (in Tocharian extended to an *n*-stem in most cases) to the root **uelH-* / **ulH-* 'to want, wish', i.e. **ulH-ro-s > Proto-Toch. *wlāræ > *lāræ > B lāre*. To this adjective a prepositional phrase **æn + *wlāræ* 'in favour' was construed in Proto-Tocharian. A substantivized **ænwālāræ > *æwlāræ > *āwlāræ* 'favoured one, friend, companion' resulted regularly in B *aulāre*, A *olar*.

§16.2. The denominative negative prefix:

§16.2.1. B *aknātsa*, A *āknats* 'unknowing, fool' with derivatives such as B *aknātsaññe*, A *ākntsune* 'ignorance' are widely attested in both languages. They reflect Common Toch. **æñknātsā* and are usually equated with Gk. *ἄγνωτος* and Skt. *ājñāta-*, cf. e.g. Van Windekens 1976:

224. However, that equation is not as self-evident as it might appear. Thus, for one thing the Greek and Indic forms have the meaning 'unknown' while the Tocharian ones mean 'ignorant'. A comparison with Gk. ἄγνός (gen. sg. ἄγνώτος) 'ignorant; unknown' might therefore be more appropriate. Second, the Tocharian forms reflect a final **-tsā* as if from I.-E. **-t-iH₂* (extended with an *n*-suffix in Tocharian [as if **-t-iH₂-n* or the like, cf. B pl. *aknātsañ*]) and is, therefore, not identical in formation with the Greek and Indic forms. Third, it seems rewarding to take **-tsā* as a Tocharian suffix forming agent nouns to the subjunctive stem of Tocharian verbs. That is, B *aknātsa*, A *āknats*, would imply and derive from a subjunctive I (or V) **knā-* (a putative subjunctive to the verb BA *knā-* 'to know' which in East Tocharian forms a nasal present VI *knānā-*⁷⁶), in the same manner as B *wapāttsa* 'weaver' derives from the subjunctive V stem *wāpā-* to the verb *wāp-* 'to weave'.

§16.2.2. B *anaiwatstse** is attested several times, while A *ānewāts** may be inferred from the abstract *ānewātsune*⁷⁷. The meaning is 'unsympathetic, unloved, (Skt.) apriya-'. Clearly a formation to a positive Common Tocharian adjective **āiwātstsæ* with a radical *ā*-vocalism that has caused umlaut of the prefix syllable, this adjective must be tied up with the verb **āiw-* > B *aiw-* 'to be inclined towards, be in sympathy with'. This verb is only found in West Tocharian where it forms a class IV present – a present class that is characterized by radical *ā*-vocalism.

⁷⁶ A *knānā-* reflects as if I.-E. **gq-n-eH₂* > Proto-Toch. **kānnā-* > **kānā-* plus a reintroduced presentic *-nā-* resulting in the present stem **kānānā-* > A *knānā-*.

⁷⁷ The suffixal *-ts-* is seen in 258 MQR b4 *anaiwatse*, and in the derived abstract 117 MQR b1 *anaiwatsñe*; further occurrences of the adjective are at 5 § a6, 279 MQR b5, 284 MQ a4, 380 § b3. Although East Tocharian has no certain instances of the adjective (presumably found in 148 b3 *ānewā(ts)*), the suffixal *-ts-* is ascertained by the derived abstract *ānewātsune* (116 b3, 304 b5). There is thus no reason to suspect a privative formation in **-āttæ* here, as contemplated by Krause 1952: 226.

However, it is doubtful that the adjective **ānāiwātstsæ* can be a direct derivative of the verb **āiw-*. Adjectives in *-tstsæ* are formed to substantives indicating a possessive relationship 'being endowed with, having the properties of', cf. Couvreur 1947: 27, Van Windekens 1979: 139; also Krause 1955: 19, Krause and Thomas 1960: 147. In his discussion of putative positive counterparts of the privatives, Krause 1952: 43 suggests that the forms B (voc. sg.) *rinaccu*, (obl. pl.) *rināccem*, and (nom. pl.) *yāmci*, might perhaps indicate the existence of the positives **rinätte* and **yāmätte* to the verbs *rin-* 'to give up' and *yām-* 'to do' resp., but that one might also assume formations in *-ts(ts)e*, in the same manner as there is a (obl. sg. fem.) *tsakatsai* 'thorny' (to a nom. sg. masc. *tsakātstse**) to the verbal root *tsāk-* 'to sting', as suggested to him privately by W. Winter. Couvreur 1954: 82, in his review of Krause 1952, asserts that *rinaccu*, etc., can "with absolute certainty" be classified as derivatives in *-tse* to a verbal root, and as a proof such formations he refers to **kārstautse*, **kautātse*, *lakūtse*, *lukšaittse*, *naut(t)se* / **nutse*, *pārsāntse*, *prekšātstse*, **trīwaitse*, *tsakātstse*. Couvreur's interpretation is not necessarily correct, however, for **kārstautse* 'broken' is clearly denominative in the sense that it is formed to the past participle *kārstau* (to B *kārst-* 'to cut off'), *lakūtse* may be formed to an original *u*-stem adjective (there is no verbal stem **lākw-*, only *lāk-*, *lākā-*), *lukšaittse* is formed to the oblique singular **lukšai* of a noun that must have had the nominative singular form **lukšā* (or possibly, but less likely, **lukšo*; there is no verbal stem **lukšai-*; nor, if *-ai-* is secondary for *-ā-*, is there any **lukšā-*, only *lukšā-*), *naut(t)se* / **nutse* are unclear in their formation (there is no attested athematic verbal stem *nautā-* / *nutā*, only B *nautā-* and A *nutā-*), *pārsāntse* is formed to a present participle and is therefore denominative, *prekšātstse*

is formed to a noun **prekṣā* (there is no such verbal stem, only *prekṣā-*), **trīwaitse* is denominative to an obl. sg. **trīwai*. For **kautātse* and *tsakatse* (for correct *tsakātstse**) one can indeed point to the verbal stems *kautā-* and *tsākā-*; however, there may also have been the nouns **kautā* 'one who is broken' and **tsākā* 'thorn' from which the adjectives were derived (*tsakatse* is thus interpreted by Isebaert 1980: 263 and Van Windekens 1979: 139). That is to say, the derivational process would have been as follows: verb yields noun in *-ā* which in turn yields an adjective in *-tstse*. This process is well illustrated by the verb B *śāmpā-* 'to be arrogant' which yielded the noun (obl. sg.) *śāmpa* 'arrogance' from which the adjective *śāmpāsse* (= *śāmpātstse**) 'arrogant' was derived.⁷⁸ In the same manner, **ānāiwātstsæ* could be seen as denominatively formed (with a negative prefix) to a noun **āiwā* rather than directly to the verb **āiwā-*.

It is not unlikely that Van Windekens 1976: 141 is right in associating the verb B *aiwā-* 'to be inclined towards, be in sympathy with' with A *yu-* 'to incline towards'. B *yu-* 'to mature, ripen' might be an equivalent of A *yu-*, assuming that its divergent meaning reflects a semantic development: 'tending toward' → 'reaching' → 'having reached, matured'. Van Windekens' connection of AB *yu-* with Skt. *vēti* 'to pursue, strive for' is phonologically impossible, however. By contrast, Duchesne-Guillemin's association (1941: 149) of this Tocharian verb with the Indo-European root **ǵeu-(H)-* 'to connect' seems a feasible alternative, although he did not go into details concerning the implied phonological development. An athematic **ǵeu-*, yielding Common Tocharian **yāw-ä- > *yuw-ä- > *yu-*, could be seen in the West Tocharian present I participle 197 M a6 *yumāne*, and in the East Tocharian adverb *yulā*

⁷⁸ For B *aknātsa*, *wapāttsa*, see §16.2.1.

'directed towards' (a petrified perlativ to a present I gerundive I **yul*) and the derived adjective *yulāsum* 'inclined toward'. To this present stem the East Tocharian causative *yu-s-* has been formed (3pl. *yuseñc*). The subjunctive V **yāw-ā-* > **yuw-ā-*, as attested in A (abstract) *ywālune*, shows the Tocharian subjunctive V marker *-ā-* (rather than the original continuant of a root final laryngeal?), and similarly the past participle B *ywau*, A *ywo*, indicates a stem in final *-ā-*. The West Tocharian causative *yuṣṣā-* / *yuwäṣṣā-* (2sg. *yust-me*, 3sg. *yuwäṣṣām*) can theoretically be based on either a stem in final *-ä-* or *-ā-*, for causatives replace stem final *-ā-* with *-ä-* before the causative marker *-ṣṣ-* / *-sk-*. The East Tocharian present III (inf. *ywatsi*) may be secondary to the present I attested to by West Tocharian and the East Tocharian adverb *yulā*. The transfer to class III may be seen in connection with the intransitive stative meaning of this verb.

It might be suggested that the present stem **yāwā-* (or the subjunctive **yāwā-*) produced a derivative noun **yāwā* 'inclination, sympathy'. Out of a collocation with the preposition **æn* 'in' there arose an adverbial **æn-yāwā* 'in sympathy', which lost the prefixal nasal regularly and reduced the internal *-yā-* to *-y-* also quite regularly (cf. Ringe 1989: 37 and Hilmarsson 1989: 14 for such a rule). The resulting Common Toch. **æywā* suffered *ā*-umlaut and yielded **āiwā*, from which the adjectives **āiwātstsæ*, negated **ānāiwātstsæ*, were formed: the latter attested as B *anaiwatstse**, A *ānewāts**. Should this analysis be correct, it necessarily follows that the verb B *aiwā-* 'to be inclined towards, be in sympathy with' must be formed to the adverbial **āiwā*, an original collocation of preposition and noun.

§16.2.3. B *aswāre* (adv.) 'not sweetly, not tenderly' is attested in H add. 149. 88 b7 (*ñi*)ś *passāmai ṣaṇ larenaṃ : aswāre ka śauwa-me* 'I

played my loved ones and let them be killed untenderly'. This word is clearly formed to the adjective B *swāre* [A *swār*] 'sweet' and has suffered *ā*-umlaut in the negating prefix. It reflects Common Toch. **æn-swāræ* as if from I.-E. **p-suH₂dro-s*. – Incidentally, Tocharian shows that the Indo-European word for "sweet" was **sueH₂d-* : **suH₂d-* and not **sūd-* : **sud-*. This is seen by the form of the initial syllable **swā-* from **suH₂-* while **sueH₂-* or **sūd-* or **sua-* would have led to a Tocharian form in initial *s-* not *sw-*. That is to say, I.-E. **sū-* before a vowel yielded Tocharian *s-*, while I.-E. **su-* before a laryngeal yielded Tocharian *sw-* (presumably through **suw-*). Thus we have, on the one hand, B *spane*, A *spām* 'sleep' < I.-E. **suepnos*, B *ser*, A *šar* 'sister' < (obl.sg.) **šāsærām* < I.-E. (acc.sg.) **suesom*, B *šan*, A *šni* poss. pron. < I.-E. **sue-*, B *škas*, A *šāk* 'six' < **šākás+* < I.-E. **sueks*, B *sātāsk-* 'exhale' < I.-E. **sūd-H₂enH₁-sk-* (and in the same manner B *ānāsk-* 'inhale' < I.-E. **H₂p-H₂enH₁-sk-*⁷⁹), BA *sātk-* '(be) spread out' < I.-E. **suid-sk-* (cf. Lith. *sviesti* 'to throw' [pres. *sviedžia*, pret. *sviedė*], Latv. *sviēst* 'id.', Lith. *sváidyti* 'to throw around', etc.), B *syā-* 'to sweat'⁸⁰ < I.-E. **suid-ǵ-* (cf. Van Windekens 1976: 448); on the other hand we have B *swāññe* adj. 'of a swine' < I.-E. **suH₂-* (B *suwo* 'swine' [obl. sg. *suwa*] < I.-E. **suH₂ōn*), B *swāñco*, *swāñciye*, A *swāñceṃ* 'sunbeam' < I.-E. **suH₂ntōn* (Hilmarsson 1987[89]), BA *swā-* 'to rain' < I.-E. **suH-*⁸¹, beside B *swāre*, A *swār* 'sweet' which in this pattern must reflect an

⁷⁹ With loss of the internal **H₁-* of the second part of the compound, and later development of Toch. **-nsk-* to *-sk-*, cf. BA *māsk-* 'to be' < **mānsk-* < **mṣsk-*, cf. §16.1.4.

⁸⁰ In the gerundive II *syālle* and the abstract *syālñe* 'perspiration' formed to a subjunctive V, possibly accompanied by a present III (cf. the deverbative substantive B *syelme* 'sweat')

⁸¹ There are problematic forms in the paradigm of this verb (e.g. A *swiñc*, *sumāṃ*), but a sequence of **suH-* is ascertained all the same.

original sequence of **suH₂-*, i.e. **suH₂dró-s*, and not a form with a vowel following the **-u-*.

Formations in prefixal **o(N)-*

§17. The prefixal vocalism suffers rounding to *o-* in both dialects if followed by certain rounding elements. The conditioning is not necessarily the same in both dialects. Already Common Tocharian is the *u*-umlaut, i.e. Common Toch. **æ(N)-* > **o(N)-* before an *-u-* of the following syllable. The same is probably true of the *o*-umlaut, although almost all instances of this are actually found in West Tocharian. Contrarily, rounding of the prefixal vocalism before any labial consonant (except *-w-*) is a purely East Tocharian change, whereas in West Tocharian rounding occurs frequently — though not consequently — before a following *-mp-* sequence. After the *o-* the nasal of the prefix is lost in East Tocharian as always (except before a following vowel), while in West Tocharian the nasal is always retained irrespective of the following sound or the place of the accent⁸².

§17.1. The local prefix:

§17.1.1. A *oklop* adv. 'in danger, in an unfortunate situation' is attested at 342 a4 and 377, 3. It is obviously formed to A *klop* 'pain; misfortune' with rounding of the prefixal vocalism through *o*-umlaut. For a discussion of these words, cf. Hilmarsson 1986b.

§17.1.2. A *omäskem* 'bad, evil' — of frequent occurrence — (with the derivative *omäskune* 'evil, badness') is not quite clear etymologically. Within Tocharian one might envisage connections in two different directions. In both instances *o-* would reflect a nasal prefix. First, as I

⁸² Exceptions, e.g. B *ośonai* and B *orkāntai*, are discussed below.

have suggested previously (Hilmarsson 1986: 192), A *omäskem* might be tied up with the verbal root A (and B) *māsk-* 'to be', in which case *o-* would reflect the negative prefix; for the semantics, cf. Skt. *asatya-* 'wrong (RV), bad (ŚBr.)' to the verb *as-* 'to be'. The formation in A *-em* would be parallel to A *plyaskem* 'meditation' to *pālsk-* 'to think', or *nuwem* 'a roar' to *nu-* 'to roar'. Second, A *omäskem* 'bad, evil' could perhaps be equated with B *amāskai* (adv.) 'with difficulty, heavily' (cf. also A *māski* 'difficult, heavy'). The final of A *omäskem* versus that of B *amāskai* has a parallel in the oblique singular form A *swāñcem* versus B *swāñcai* 'sunbeam'. The *-ä-* of A *omäskem* has suffered reduction in a medial syllable (cf. Krause & Thomas 1960: 46) and might derive from **-ā-* as preserved in the West Tocharian form. The only phonological problem with the equation of A *omäskem* with B *amāskai* appears to be that of the initial vocalism. In B *amāskai* the radical *-ā-* has caused *ā*-umlaut of the initial **æ-*, changing it into **ā- > a-*, whereas in East Tocharian no *ā*-umlaut seems to have taken place. The *o-* of A *omäskem* must reflect a rounded *a-* (< **æ-*), for there is no particular reason to assume that an umlauted **ā-* could be rounded to *o-* (cf. A *āmpi*, *āmpuk* 'both'). However, although *ā*-umlaut generally shows its effects in East and West Tocharian alike (cf. e.g. A *āknats*, B *aknātsa* 'ignorant', A *ānewāts*, B *anaiwatstse* 'unloved, unsympathetic'), there are instances where the *ā*-umlaut has operated in West but not in East Tocharian, cf. B *pratsāko* vs. A *pratsak* 'breast'. It is conceivable that A *omäskem*, B *amāskai*, is a further example of that. Should this latter explanation of A *omäskem* be correct, the prefix *o-* must be classified as the *a-* of B *amāskai*, i.e. as a local prefix, whose rounding was effected through the following *-m-*. For a quite different and altogether dubious interpretation of A *omäskem*, see Van Windekens 1976: 334-335.

§17.1.3. B *omotruññaiṣṣe* is an adjective that occurs in the Otani text 19.1 line 3–4.⁸³ From the quite unbroken context it is clear that this word refers to a direction. Here we have the sequence *kom pirko[mem]* ‘from/in the east’ ... *omotruññaiṣṣe* ... *kom [k]läskomem* ‘from/in the west’ ... *oṣṣalemem* ‘from/in the north’ (s.v. *oṣṣale* below). It is likely that *omotruññaiṣṣe* has the meaning ‘southerly, southern, of the south’. It is an adjective in *-ṣṣe* formed to the oblique singular *omotruññai** to a putative nominative *omotruñño** or probably rather to a feminine adjectival *omotruñña** (to a masc. *omotruññe**), which probably had the meaning ‘south; southern’, although that meaning, of course, need not be the original one, cf. B *oṣṣalemem* ‘from the north’ to *oṣṣale** whose original meaning may have been ‘in darkness’ (cf. below). Tocharian cognates of B *omotruññaiṣṣe* are somewhat unclear, but one might, firstly, think of a connection with A *mācrim* for which Winter 1988: 781 posits the meaning ‘southeast’. The relation B *omotruñño/a** : A *mācrim* resembles (but is not identical with) that of B *oñkarño / oñkorño* : A *oñkrim* ‘milk and rice porridge’ (cf. below), but the phonological details escape me at the moment. B *omotruñño/a** appears to be a formation of the type B *kotruññe* to B *kottär* ‘gotra’, i.e. it could presuppose a basic **mot(t)är*, assuming that the initial *o-* is a prefix. That is **mot(t)är* produced the derivate **motruññe* and a prepositional phrase **æn + *motruññai* (fem. obl. sg.) yielded B *omotruññai** the basis of *omotruññaiṣṣe*. In this word, the prefixal vocalism has suffered umlaut through the effect of the radical one. That analysis brings us to a second possible cognate within Tocharian, viz. B H 149. 314 b5 (*mo*)*tärccce*

⁸³ I am grateful to my colleague G. Pinault for supplying me with his personal transcription of this extremely interesting text, a further form of which is discussed below (see under B *oṣṣale**).

'green, (Skt) *harita*', KVāc. 30 a3 fem. pl. *motarcca(na)*, and A 346 a4 fem. sg. nom. *motarci*, cf. the discussion of these words by K. T. Schmidt (1984: 152, 1986a: 142), who suggests an etymological connection with the Slavic adjective of colour **modrŭ* 'blue' (e.g. Czech *modrý*). That connection may be tempting, but the radical -o- of B *motärtstse**, *omotruññaişse*, and of A *motarci* remains unexplained. Should these words be related to A *măcriṃ* as suggested here, one would perhaps prefer to think of an Indo-European root with an *u*-diphthong, e.g. Pokorny's (1959: 742) **meut-* 'dark and wet; morass, moor, mud', *vel sim.*, but problems remain.

§17.1.4. B *ompalsko* is attested only once and the context is too broken to yield satisfactorily to a translation: 360 Qu b4 /// *m·ompalsko sū rṣāke : caṃkramit*. It clearly derives from B *palsko* 'thought' and can presumably be seen as reflecting an earlier prepositional phrase **æn + pälsko* 'in thought'. From *ompalsko* comes the widely attested derivative *ompalskoññe* 'meditation' (e.g. 4 Š b7) as if to an abstract formation **pälskoññe* 'thinking'. The very few instances of the variant spelling *ompolskoññe* (e.g. 297 T 3, 7) are probably to be seen as products of sporadic (accidental?) assimilation. The rounding of the initial vocalism has been caused by the following sequence of -mp-, cf. B *ompostām*, *omprotärtstse**.

§17.1.5. B *ompostām* prep.-adv. 'after, behind, later' is widely attested, and is clearly formed to the apparently synonymous B *postām*. For a parallel to such a formation, cf. Icel. *eftir* and *á eftir*, both 'after, behind, later', Swed. *sen* and *i sen* both 'later, afterwards', etc. The rounded prefixal vocalism of *ompostām* is either conditioned by the

following *-o-*, or by the sequence *-mp-* which sometimes causes rounding in West Tocharian; see Hilmarsson 1986: 48-49 for a discussion of this word.

§17.1.6. B *omprotärtstse** adj. 'brotherly, who is in a brotherly relation with someone' (Thomas / Krause 1964: 176 "verbrüder") is a *hapax legomenon* attested in 108 S a8 *tumem cey^ä wi omprotärcci kāsya[pi] šesa (akla)šlyemmpa maitare* 'thereupon the two brotherly Kāsapa's went together with the disciples'. Also here the prefix can be interpreted as having a local function ('being in brotherhood with, being in a brotherly relation with'). The rounded prefixal vocalism can be seen as caused either by the *-o-* of the following syllable, or by the following sequence of *-mp-*.

§17.1.7. B *oñkor* (adv.) is glossed with 'together' in the handbooks, cf. Thomas & Krause 1964: 175 "zusammen", Van Windekens 1976: 338 "ensemble". However, Thomas already in 1957 (: 92, ftn. 1) pointed out that *oñkor* might mean something similar to Skt. *puṣa-* 'fold; cover'. Thomas' surmise seems well founded, for an adverbial 'in a cover' seems the most natural interpretation of this word in B 79 Š 2 (*stmo)rmeṃ kertteṃ oñkor mälkānte* 'having taken (position), they sheathed [their] swords' (i.e. '... they laid [their] swords in a cover'), whereas 118 MQR a6 *t=ōñkor mälko* (MQ for *mälkau*) *tākam* is contextually unclear, probably 'he had laid it in a cover' (i.e. 'covered it' — possibly with the *wastsī* 'garment' mentioned one line above). A third and last instance is found in the line 516 M b5 *tan[e] aṃśūktsa oñkor yāmormem* 'now having covered with the aṃśūk-garment' (i.e. '... having put in a cover...').

This "new" meaning of B *oñkor* annuls all previous etymological

explanations of this word⁸⁴. It seems natural to interpret *oñ-* here as the local prefix ('in a cover') that has been umlauted by the following *o*-vocalism. The remaining *-kor* could be seen as parallel to B *ṣñor* 'sinew' from I.-E. **sneH₂ur*, B *ñor* 'beneath, under' from I.-E. **neH₂ur*, and B *kror-*, A *kror* 'horn; crescent', from I.-E. **ghreH₂ur*, through a Common Toch. **æwār*. That is, B *-kor* 'cover' could reflect an I.-E. **koḡH₂* to the root **(s)keuH-* 'to cover', see Pokorny 1959: 951. If the laryngeal of the proposed Indo-European preform **koḡH₂* was **H₁* this form would result in Common Toch. **kæwār* and with contraction **kor* (as Common Toch. **ṣñæwār* 'sinew' > *ṣñor*, etc.). That is, **æñ-kæwār* > **æñ-kor* > *oñkor*. If the laryngeal was **H₂* (or **H₃*), whereby the Common Tocharian preform would have to be reconstructed **kæwār*, it is conceivable that the contraction would still have resulted in **kor*, for I am unaware of examples that would decisively show the result of the contraction of that sequence.

§17.1.8. B *oñkorñō*, *oñkarñō* 'sweet milk-and-rice porridge, (Skt.) madhu-pāyasa-'. Analysis of this word is difficult as the etymology is unclear. Van Windekens derives it from B *oñkor*, which I have accepted previously (Hilmarsson 1986: 44), but that is actually somewhat difficult phonologically, for an underlying *oñkor* would leave the alternant form *oñkarñō* unexplained. Semantically, such a derivation is even impossible, for *oñkor*, glossed in the handbooks with 'together' (Thomas & Krause 1964: 175 "zusammen"), actually has the sense 'in a fold, folding, cover, sheath' (*vel sim.*) in its three occurrences, as

⁸⁴ The most recent – and one that takes into account the meaning 'in a cover' – etymological explanation of this word that I am aware of is that of Pinault 1990: 170 who suggests a preform **H₂enk-ur* (to **H₂enk-* 'bend') > **ankur* > Proto-Toch. **ānkur* and finally B *oñkor* through *u*-umlaut of *ā-* and a "nivellement" of the sound *o* in both syllables. In my opinion Tocharian *ā* did not suffer *u*-umlaut (cf. e.g. A *ākār*, B pl. *akrūna* 'tear(s)' from Proto-Toch. **ākru*, etc.), and I would therefore reject Pinault's etymology.

implied by Thomas 1957: 92, ftn. 1, see discussion of this word in §17.1.7 above.

Winter 1988: 785 discusses the alternation of *-kor-* and *-kar-* in this word. He asserts that a nominative form B *oñkarño* does not occur, and concludes that the five instances of the oblique form *oñkarñai* (as against twelve of *oñkorñai* to a nominative *oñkorño* 3x) is a far too high an incidence to consider this form wrong (as done by e.g. Van Windekens 1976: 338). Winter thereupon suggests that there may have co-existed an unlevelled paradigm (nominative B *oñkorño*, oblique *oñkarñai*) and a levelled one (nominative B *oñkorño*, oblique *oñkorñai*), and that the *-o-* of *oñkorño* was triggered by the final *-o* of the nominative. This view has the consequence that the initial *o-* must have been rounded through the effect of the consonantism rather than the vocalism — otherwise there should have been no rounding in the form *oñkarñai*.

There is no doubt that most of Winter's observations are correct and well-founded, but one may disagree on some points. First, Winter operates only with the forms of this word that occur in the text 107, omitting the forms that occur in the Weber and Pelliot manuscripts (Filliozat 1948). Here we find two occurrences of a nominative *oñkarño* (W 7 b4 *malkwersa oñkarño pākṣa(l)l(a)* 'porridge is to be cooked with milk', and P 1 a6 *oñkarño pākṣalya* 'porridge is to be cooked') and an adjectival *oñkarñatsta* 'of porridge'. That is, Winter's statement that *oñkarño* is not found in the nominative is incorrect. Second, while Winter's suggestion that there were two co-existing paradigms of this word deriving from a single earlier paradigm is extremely likely; it is at least conceivable (instead of assuming with Winter that one was levelled and one was not) that both of these paradigms were levelled: *oñkorño* /

oñkorñai on the one hand, and *oñkarñō* / *oñkarñai* on the other. Third, Winter's suggestion that *-kor-* originated in the nominative, and *-kar-* in the oblique of an earlier paradigm *oñkorñō* / *oñkarñai* must surely be correct. Fourth, one may doubt Winter's explanation of the rounded initial vocalism, for words like B *eñkwe* 'man', on the one hand, and *eñklyaušätte* 'unheard', etc., on the other, seem to indicate that *-ñk(w)-* was no rounding factor in West Tocharian. That is, it is the radical vocalism that must be responsible for the rounding.

It is only by positing an original **-u-* in the radical syllable that one can explain an earlier paradigm *oñkorñō* / *oñkarñai*. This radical **-u-* caused an *u*-umlaut of the prefixal vocalism, changing Common Toch. **æn-* to **on-* in the entire paradigm. The **-u-* thereupon yielded Common Toch. **-ä-* (> B **-ǎ-* > *-a-*) in the oblique regularly, but was umlauted to Common Toch. **-o-* by the nominative final **-o*.

Although B *oñkorñō* / *oñkarñai* may thus be understandable in terms of Tocharian historical phonology, the question of the etymological origin of this word remains unanswered. The following proposal is perhaps somewhat frivolous: Old Icel. *grautr* 'porridge, gruel' indicates Gmc. **grauti-*, and OHG. *guzzi* 'porridge, grit, (Germ.) Grütze' indicates Gmc. **grutya-*. An *n*-stem extended with a suffixal **-iHo-* could give us a Pre-Toch. **ghrud-n-iHo-*, extended to an *n*-stem in Proto-Toch. **ghrudniHōn*. After the loss of intervocalic laryngeals, subsequent glide insertion, loss of **-d-* before resonants, loss of aspiration and voicedness in the occlusive series, and palatalization, this form would emerge in the guise **kruñiyō(n)* / (obl.) **kruñiyān-*, and with the affixation of the local prefix we would get **æñkruñiyō(n)* / (obl.) **æñkruñiyān-*, which would suffer *u*-umlaut to **oñkruñ-* in the entire paradigm. Thereupon the change **u > *ä* occurred, and **-CRä-*

suffered metathesis to **-CäR-* (*R* signifies here at least *r* and *l*), cf. B *kälymiye*, A *kälyme* 'region' < **klyäm-*, etc., producing the Common Tocharian forms **oñkäññiyo* / **oñkäññiyān-* → **oñkäññiyai-*. Final **-iy-*, unaccented, was reduced to **-y-* (this change may have occurred much earlier though, at the time Sievers' Law ceased to operate), and *-rñy-* was assimilated to **-rñ-*, producing the forms **oñkäñño* / **oñkäññai*. In the nominative *-ä-* was rounded to *-o-*, but remained unrounded in the oblique, viz. B *oñkorño* / *oñkarñai*.

§17.1.8.1. In East Tocharian the form *oñkrim* 'sweet milk-and-rice porridge' has recently been discovered (Pinault 1990: 167–171). As shown by Pinault this form in all probability reflects an earlier A **oñkäriññ* < **oñkäriñña* and thus more or less corresponds to B *oñkorño* / *oñkarño* (actually, it seems to me that A *oñkrim* could reflect earlier **oñkäñño* and therefore match B *oñkorño* / *oñkarño* perfectly). I deviate from Pinault only in assuming that the rounded initial vocalism in both Tocharian languages has been caused by the original *u*-vocalism of the radical syllable, while Pinault, following Winter, assumes that the rounding has been caused by the following cluster containing a velar occlusive. It appears, however, that such a rounding did not occur in West Tocharian.

§17.1.9. A *opäntäs*, apparently an ablative to *opänt** used adverbially, is a *hapax legomenon* attested in 383 a2 *tmäs opäntäs mäskit klānt*. A *opänt** probably has the meaning 'inbetween; a while, meantime', if one judges by the corresponding, frequently attested, B *epiñkte* 'inbetween; interval' (B *snai epiñkte* 'immediately'). A 383 a2 then translates 'thereupon, after a while, [they] brought the prince'. It was Winter (1982: 401) who first joined B *epiñkte* and A *opänt**, and suggested quite plausibly that these words derive through prefixation

from the word for 'fifth', B *piñkte*, A *pänt*. The underlying Common Tocharian form, then, is **æñ-p'änktæ* (with the local prefix), meaning '(that which is) in the fifth (place)', i.e. 'in the middle' with reference to the cardinal points. Clearly, A *o-* has been rounded through the effect of the following labial, while B *e-* remains quite regularly unaffected.⁸⁵

§17.1.10. A *opärkā* adv. 'at sunrise' is a *hapax legomenon* found at 265 a3. It is formed to the verb A *pärk-* 'to rise', which reflects I.-E. **bhṛgh-*. I have previously expressed the opinion (Hilmarsson 1986: 180-181) that such a formation here is unjustified, on the grounds that rounding would not occur in East Tocharian before a *p* from I.-E. **bh*, but only before a *p* from I.-E. **p* or **b*. I therefore suggested a different etymology for A *opärkā*. However, semantic considerations make it very hard to dismiss the existence of an etymological connection between A *opärkā* and the verb *pärk-* (cf. also Winter's discussion of these words and B *-pirko* '(sun)rise', etc., Winter 1988: 776-779). I, therefore, now feel obliged to retract my earlier view. A different explanation of the rounded vocalism of forms like A *opärkā*, *opäntäṣ* 'inbetween', *opäṣṣi* 'adept, skilful', *opyāc* 'in memory', *opṣäly* 'season', as against the unrounded one of A *apärkār* 'in length, in detail' and *apälkāt* 'unworried', can be proposed. In view of the fact that the forms with umlauted vocalisms are matched by forms in B *e-* (in as far as they have correspondences in West Tocharian, viz. B *epiñkte*, *epastyē*, *epiyac*, *ekṣalye*), whereas the non-umlauted forms are matched by forms in B *eN-* (viz. B *emparkre*, *empalkaitte*), it would seem a reasonable guess that the factor that conditioned the loss or retention of the nasal in the West Tocharian forms was also responsible for the umlaut or non-umlaut of the East Tocharian forms.

⁸⁵ A different etymology of B *epiñkte* is offered by Van Windekens 1976: 180 (to the root **bheg-* / *bheng-* 'to break').

§17.1.11. B *oppīlom*, *oppilomtstse**, *oppīlām** (or *oppīlām-tstse** ?). This word, or rather, these words, have received no satisfactory explanation in our handbooks. Their meaning has been declared uncertain by e.g. Thomas & Krause 1964: 176: "... viell. 'in einer Reihe', d.h. 'in gleicher Größe'" who, furthermore, point out that in the text B 542 M a4 the form *oppīlom* renders Skt. "guṇa". This view is taken up by Van Windekens 1976: 339 who thereupon offers a corresponding etymology. — However, this interpretation is demonstrably wrong. The text B 542 M a4 is a bilingual and offers a word for word Tocharian translation of a Sanskrit phrase: *//// guṇaparikṣiptā api • pāssaksa oppīlom tetarkuwa rano ////*. Quite uncharacteristically, Thomas & Krause seem to have overlooked the fact that in Buddhist terminology, especially in Pāli, the word *guṇa*-commonly has the meaning 'cluster (of flowers), bouquet, garland', cf. Edgerton 1985: 212. Clearly, therefore, it is *pāssaksa*, the perlativ to B *pāssakw* 'garland', that translates *guṇa*- here. Consequently, since *tetarkuwa* translates *-kṣiptā* and *rano* translates *api*, it must be *oppīlom* that translates *pari*-. The Sanskrit phrase thus means '... overstrewn with a cluster (of flowers) even'. Now, Krause 1952: 183, n. 1, interprets *tetarkuwa* as a preterite participle to the preterite class IIIaβ, and assigns the meaning 'turn, (Germ.) drehen' to the underlying, otherwise unattested, root *tārk*- with which this participle, in his opinion, belongs. Again, this interpretation is probably incorrect. The participle *tetarkuwa* (fem. to the masc. *tetarku**) can be a causative of preterite class II in the same manner as we have the causative participle pret. II *peprañku* to *prāñk*- intrans. 'to hold back', caus. trans. 'to turn away'. The participle *tetarku**, (fem. *tetarkuwa*) would then be the only attested

causative form to the well attested “Grundverb” *tärk-* ‘to release, let go’. The sense of the causative would have been ‘to strew, scatter, dissipate’, as implied by the Sanskrit verb. The idiom *oppīlom tärk-* can then be assigned the meaning ‘to scatter over, to strew over, (Skt.) *pari-kṣip-*’, and the entire Tocharian phrase would translate in the same fashion as the Sanskrit one: ‘... with a garland (i.e. a cluster of flowers) overstrewn even’. Formally, *oppīlom* is an adverb, a petrified prepositional phrase **æn + pīlom* (for the precise meaning of this phrase, see the following discussion). Interestingly, two changes or additions to this text have been written interlinearly in a different hand. The first is *oppīlomccem*, which clearly is intended to replace the text form *oppīlom*. Sieg & Siegling (1953: 339, fn. 12) suggest that *oppīlomccem* is a wrong form and that one might have expected *oppīlomtstsana*, i.e. a form that would inflect with the participial *tetarkuwa*. In my view that is not necessarily so. The author of the interlinear gloss may have intended it to inflect with the preceding *pässaksa*, in which case *oppīlomccem* is a correct oblique singular form to a possessive adjective *oppīlomtstse**. Such an interpretation of the scribe’s intention appears to be confirmed by the second interlinear gloss, where, after the word *pässaksa* (and under *oppīlom*) he writes *šše palīsa wat*, clearly a shortening for *(pässak)šše palīsa wat*. Now, *palīsa*, a perlativ to a presumable *palī**, is a *hapax legomenon*, but the suggestion would not seem far-fetched that this word is related to the *-pīl-* of *oppīlom*. The noun *palī* could be parallel to B *nāki* ‘blame’, *wāki* ‘difference’, etc., to a non-attested verb **pāl-*. Since *oppīlom* in our text translates Skt. *pari-*, and thus appears to have the meaning ‘over’ or the like, the gloss *(pässak)šše palīsa wat* ‘or with a *palī* of (flower-)cluster / garland’ very likely means ‘or with a cover of

garland(s)'. My suggestion thus is that *oppīlom* 'over' has developed its sense from an underlying basic meaning 'covering, in a cover' from an earlier 'on-covering, (Germ.) überdeckend'. The relationship of the root form of *oppīlom* to that of *palī* could be that of a historical normal grade (*-p'āl- > B -pīl-, cf. B *mit* 'honey' < *m'ātā) to a historical zero grade *pāl-.

Apart from the occurrence of *oppīlom* and *oppīlomccem* in 542 M a4, an *oppīlāmtsa* occurs in H 149. 4 a4 and in the identical H add. 149. 84 b2. Here — i.e. the first text, the latter is more fragmentary — the text reads *Kāḷodāye rano alyekā kca stām ñor oppīlāmtsa niṣīdaṃ raksate lyama* 'Kaḷodāyin also spread out [his] mat *oppīlāmtsa* under a tree [lit. 'some tree'] [and] sat down'. If one interprets *oppīlāmtsa* as a perative to an oblique form *oppīlām**, this word might be translated 'as a cover', which gives good sense in its context.

The final of *oppīlām** as against that of *oppīlom* is somewhat problematic. However, in view of the *n*-stem flexion of *oppīlom*, and the *men*-stem flexion of *palī** (as implied by the parallel B *nāki*, pl. *nakanma* (A *nākām*)), it seems likely that *oppīlām** also reflects an *n*-stem, possibly an old petrified oblique form, reshaped in *oppīlom* on the model of a nominative *oppīlo**. Assuming that *oppīl-* has been assimilated from an earlier **om-pīl-*, the rounded initial vocalism can be seen as parallel to that of B *omprotārtstse**, *ompalskoññe*, *ompakwättñe*, etc., i.e. rounding of B **e-* before **mp-*.

The "new" meaning of these words as suggested here offers the possibility of a plausible etymological association. An I.-E. **pel-* 'to cover; to fold' (Pokorny 1959: 802 and 803), with derivatives such as **pel-mp* / **p]men-* (e.g. Gk. *πέλα* 'sole of a foot / shoe', Toch. B *palī*),

**pel-n-* (e.g. OÍcel. *fell* 'skin', Lat. *pellis* 'hide, skin'), etc., would provide a fitting basis for the Tocharian words.⁸⁶

§17.1.12. B *orkāntai* adv. 'to and fro, back and forth' is attested four times and in three of these instances (88 Š a4, 108 S b5, H 149. 69 a3) its meaning is quite clear, whereas in the fourth the context is inscrutable (H 149. add. 44 b3). Van Windekens 1976: 341 explains this word as deriving from a prefixed verbal root **rāk-* < I.-E. **ruk-* (with cognates in Germanic). A putative **H₁q-ruk-qt-* could have resulted in B **orkānt-* by *u*-umlaut through an intermediate Common Tocharian **on-rākānt-* > **o-rākānt-*, for *-ä-*, even if accented, is lost in Tocharian after *-r-* in non-initial syllables.⁸⁷ However, the lack of inner-Tocharian relations render Van Windekens' etymology *ad hoc* and unappealing. Winter 1988: 786 suggests instead an association with Toch. A *wärkānt* 'wheel' (to the Indo-European root **werg-*, cf. Skt. *vṛṇākti* 'turns') and reconstructs an underlying **werK-qt-* that produced in Tocharian the derivative **ē-w'ark-qt-* with a prefixal **ē-*, which — if I have understood correctly — Winter considers the regular reflex of I.-E. **ō-*, a prefix meaning 'close to'. The adverb B *orkāntai*, Winter (p. 787) suggests, had the meaning 'in the manner of one who turns', and rounding of the initial vocalism was effected before Common Toch. **w'* resulted in B *y*. This explanation rests upon the assumption that I.-E. **ō* yielded Toch. **e* (i.e. in my notation **æ*) that Winter has previously

⁸⁶ B *oppīlōm*, etc., has been discussed quite recently by Adams (1990: 82–85). His views are entirely different from those propounded here, since he argues that in text B 542 *oppīlōm* must translate Skt. *guṇa-*. Even if Adams is right that in this text /// *guṇa* stands for (*mālā*)*guṇa*, I think the whole form *mālāguṇa* could have been rendered with Toch. *pässaksa*, whereby *oppīlōm* would still equal Skt. *pari*. At least the occurrence of *oppīlāmtsa* in the texts H 149. 4 a4 and H add. 149. 84 b2 appears more favourable to that view than to Adams'.

⁸⁷ This phenomenon often has the appearance of a metathesis, i.e. *-rā-* > *-är-*, cf. e.g. B *ścīrye* < **ścārye* < **ścṛāye* < **ścār'āye*. A parallel change must be assumed for **-lā-* which also loses its **-ä-* and introduces a new *-ä-* preceding the *-l-*, cf. B *kälymiye* < **klyāmiye*.

hinted at, cf. e.g. 1962: 127. The *communis opinio*, however, is that I.-E. *ō is reflected by a Tocharian *ā, cf. B *sāle* 'basis, foundation' with Lith. *súolas* 'bench', B *alyiye**, A *āle** 'palm (of the hand)' with Gk. *ὠλήν* 'arm, elbow', etc. (for an entirely different view, cf. Kortlandt 1988: 80sq.). I would therefore assume that Winter's putative I.-E. *ō-(H₂)*uerg-qt-* would in Tocharian result in *āw'ärk-qt- and finally in B *airkānt-, cf. the West Tocharian privatives discussed in §8sq. above, e.g. *aitkatte** 'uncommissioned' < *æ-w'átkā- < *æn-w'átkā-. Besides, I am of the opinion that the Indo-European prefix *ō- 'close to' is not represented among the prefixed formations under discussion in this paper⁸⁸. Rather, we are always confronted here with the "local" prefix / adverb *H₁en- / *H₁p- 'in, on'.

Winter's etymological connection, however, is attractive and must surely be correct — *mutatis mutandis*. I would suggest a formation based on the preform of B *yerkwanto** 'wheel' (attested is the obl. sg. *yerkwantai*; East Tocharian has *wärkänt*), i.e. a pre-B *æn-w'ærk(w)-änt- > *æw'ærk(w)änt- > B *ew'erkänt- > *orkänt-* with contraction to *o-* before the change of B *w'* to *y* and labialization of the contraction product. That the initial syllable of this word is a contraction product is virtually guaranteed by the initial accentuation. B *orkäntai* 'to and fro' would thus reflect an earlier prepositional phrase *æn + w'ærk(w)äntai 'in the manner of one who turns, in a turning manner'.

As already indicated (§17), the nasal of the nasal prefixes is regularly retained in West Tocharian if preceded by a rounded vocalism. The lack of a nasal in B *orkäntai* would therefore appear incongruous. The explanation of this is presumably to be seen in connection with the initial accent, that is to say, the initial accent indicates a contraction

⁸⁸ Note, however, perhaps B *akartte*, §16.1.1.

product but the contraction product *o-* need not necessarily imply a pre-contraction prefixal *o-*. The *o-* of *orkāntai* arose through contraction from **æw'æ-* and it can be safely assumed that the nasal of the prefix was lost already before the resulting *o-* arose. The lack of a nasal in *orkāntai* need therefore not be seen as contradicting the rule that the prefixal nasal is retained after a preceding *o-*.

§17.1.13. B *ośonai* (adv). is attested twice, at 535 D b3 and H 149. add. 117 b1. In the first instance this word stands isolated in a broken context. In the second instance we have /// (*kaly*)*m(isa) [o]śonai palsko* /// which may be a parallel to line b4 of the same text /// *cwī nī kalymisa [śon]ai palskone* ///. Broomhead 1962b: 159 translates *ośonai* with 'out of enmity, hostility', clearly associating this word with B *ś(c)ono*, obl. sg. *ś(c)onai*, 'hate', which seems reasonable. The *o-* here has been rounded through the effect of the following *-o-*. This word clearly reflects an earlier prepositional phrase **æn + śconai* 'in hate, in enmity'. The loss of the prefixal nasal, which appears to contradict the rule that after *o-* the nasal is retained in West Tocharian (for *orkāntai*, cf. above), calls for a modification of that rule, namely to the effect that the dental nasal is lost before a following consonant cluster; therefore B *ośonai* as B *oşsale*, but B *ontsoytte* (with a non-organic *-t-*), cf. below.

§17.1.14. B *oşsale** is a prose form attested three times⁸⁹ as against the verse form *oşle* of 69 Š a2. Besides, there is the adjectival *oşsaleşse* (prose form: 508 Š b1, 509 Š b3-4, 612 X a5). The meaning of these forms is generally believed to have been 'west, evening; westerly' *vel sim*. Thus Sieg & Siegling 1949: 104 say: "vermutlich 'Westen,

⁸⁹ Attested always with the ablative affix, i.e. *oşsalemem*, in 303 M (frgm.) a, H 149. add. 115 b5, Ötani 19.1, cf. K. T. Schmidt *apud* Winter 1988: 789, ftn. 2, but see also further comments below. The form *oşale* given by Broomhead 1962a: 232 is based on an erroneous reading. In a letter of April 1990, G. Pinault informs me that the text in question, PK 13 E b1 has *omşa/p* and not *oşale*.

Abend'", Thomas & Krause 1964: 177 translate *oşle* unhesitatingly with "abends" which is repeated by Van Windekens 1976: 344 ("le soir"). Winter 1988: 783-786 argues for the meaning 'west' and suggests a connection with B *şale* 'mountain' and with A *şul* 'mountain' and *şuliñc* (possibly) 'westerly' (with semantic parallels from Turkic languages). However, Winter also cites (op. cit., p. 789, ftn. 2) a personal communication made to him by K. T. Schmidt that in the Otani text 19.1 B *oşşalemeṃ* is to be rendered 'from the north' as against an adjacent *kom-kläskomeṃ* 'from the west', and Lubotsky 1988: 92 refers a remark of K. T. Schmidt's (p.c.) that in several unpublished texts B *oş(şale)* has the meaning 'in the mountains, in the north' rather than 'in the evening'. My colleague G. Pinault has generously supplied me with a transcription of the Otani text in question, based on a reading of a good photograph in his possession of the text.⁹⁰ It is quite clear that 'from the west' or 'in the west' is rendered here by B *kom-[k]läskomeṃ* for the verb *kälsk-* means 'to go down' (used of the sun), cf. 305 Š b3 *[kä]lsk[ā]lyñ(e) yan[e](ṃ)* translating Skt. *astam gacchanti*. The text lists the location of borderlines with regard to the four directions in the order east-south-west-north (*kom-pirko[meṃ]* 'from the east', *kom-[k]läskomeṃ* 'from the west') and *oşşalemeṃ* – since it cannot be 'from the west' – must be 'from the north', while 'southern' appears to be designated by *omotruññaişşe*, for which see above.⁹¹

§17.1.14.1. Significantly, in at least one instance B *oşle* appears not to designate a direction at all. In the text B 69 Š a2 — *oşle pākṛe klain[ām]pa kca treṇsate* the word *oşle* is rather unclear, but the assumption of a directional sense seems unwarranted. The interpretation

⁹⁰ According to Pinault (p.c.) a less readable photograph of this text was published in *Seiki kōko zufu*, Tōkyō, 1915, vol. II, pl. 19.

⁹¹ I refrain from citing more from this extremely interesting text, as Pinault will no doubt bring it out with comments in the near future.

of this word here depends to some degree on the meaning assigned to *pākre*, itself a *hapax legomenon*. Sieg & Siegling 1949: 80 translated: ‘... abends und morgens (?) hängte er sich an eine Frau’. Winter (*l.c.*) suggests that Sieg and Siegling possibly assumed a genetic connection between the well attested B *pākri* ‘clear, evident’ and *pākre* which could then be a term for ‘in the morning’. The adjacent *oṣle* could then be an antonym of *pākre*, the two meaning ‘in the evening [and] in the morning’. This might, of course, be a correct interpretation, but then again it might not. If one accepts the association of B *pākre* with *pākri* ‘clear, evident’, which seems a rather attractive choice, one might perhaps rather suggest for *pākre* the meaning ‘publicly, (lit.) in the open’ (cf. B *apākārtse* ‘openly, in the open’; note that the sequence *oṣle pākre* could reflect *oṣle apākre* through *sandhi* and the form *apākre* might thus be seen as containing the local prefix as *oṣle* in all probability does), whereby the antonym in the construction, *oṣle*, could be assigned the meaning ‘in secret, (lit.) in the dark’. This is the interpretation opted for in §16.1.7 above. The text fragment in question could then be translated: ‘in secret and in public he clung to a certain woman’.

Let us now take a look at the remaining attested instances of this West Tocharian word. We have seen that in 69 Š a2 (*oṣle*) our word seems to be best translated with ‘in darkness’. A directional sense seems to be excluded. On the other hand, *oṣṣalemeṃ* of Otani 19.1 occurs in a context that excludes a rendering with ‘in the west’ because of the preceding *kom-[k]läskomeṃ* that has to be assigned precisely that meaning. The remaining instances known to me at present are not decisive. The fragment 303 M a /// *oṣṣalemeṃ* ///, of course, tells us nothing, and H 149. add. 115 b5 /// *ś* · - *oṣṣalemeṃ wa(r)*, translated by Broomhead 1962a: 231 with ‘... from the west / sunset, the water’, is less

than clear. In 612 X a5 the broken passage /// (o)şşaleşse nau[ntai]ne —
 /// could be correctly translated by Winter (1988: 783) with ‘on the western road’, but ‘... northern road’ or ‘... dark road’ are equally possible. And we encounter the same ambiguity in 508 Š b1 /// (tāko)[yc]er (lo) l[y]m[oš] (sic, for °š) o(š)s(a)l(e)şşai [nikš](ātrā) /// ‘if you had been seated, the western / northern / dim constellation’ and 509 Š b3-4 (o)şşal[e](şş)ai (kā)l[y](m)i[n]e kāryofrt[au] /// ‘in the western / northern / dark region, the merchant ...’, although in these two latter instances a directional sense (i.e. either ‘western’ or ‘northern’) would seem quite probable. A semantic development from ‘dark’ to ‘north’ or ‘west’ would not appear unreasonable (viz. ‘darkness’ → ‘direction of darkness [i.e. west or north]’). That is to say, there is no absolute indication that oşşale* means ‘west’ or ‘western’, while the Otani text 19.1 definitely suggests ‘north’ or ‘northern’, which could also apply in all other instances, except in the case of 69 Š a2 oşle which quite probably has the meaning ‘in darkness, in secret’. A semantic association of the concepts ‘darkness’ and ‘northern’ is surely defensible.

§17.1.14.2. One must then face the question whether oşşale* is genetically related to and derived from the word for mountain, B şale, as suggested by Winter (op. cit.). In my opinion, a relationship is possible here, only if şale ‘mountain’ originally means ‘a place of darkness, a place of cover, hiding’, *vel sim.*; that is to say, it could be assumed that a term with the basic sense ‘darkness’ could generate terms meaning ‘north’ on the one hand, and terms meaning ‘mountain’ on the other. A semantic development in the opposite direction, i.e. from a basic ‘mountain’ to ‘darkness’, seems to me less likely, while, admittedly ‘mountain’ might generate the meaning ‘north’ in a given geographical environment, as suggested by Winter. In accordance with this view, B

*oṣṣale** would not be derived from B *ṣale* 'mountain' but would presuppose an earlier B **ṣale* 'darkness'.

Contrarily, the traditional derivation of A *ṣuliñc* from A *ṣul* 'mountain' need not be doubted. A *ṣuliñc* is assigned the meaning 'mountainous' by Poucha (1955: 349), Thomas & Krause (1964: 150, who add that it designates a celestial region), and Van Windekens (1976: 465). However, Winter (1988, esp. p. 782sq.) shows conclusively that *ṣuliñc* refers to a direction, suggesting the meaning 'west, westerly'. It is clear that A *koṃpärkānt* is 'east', and *koṃtpānt*, as shown by Winter (op. cit., p. 781) is 'south'. The East Tocharian texts offer us two further terms covering the two remaining cardinal directions: *koṃwmānt* and *ṣuliñc*. Sieg & Siegling & Schulze 1931: 278 translated *koṃwmānt* with "Westen (?)", and this remains a reasonable choice in view of the context, viz. 259 Š a2 *yäṣ koṃpärkāntac yäṣ ṣkāṛā koṃwmānt yäṣ ṣu[l](iñcām kälýmeyac?)* '(he) goes to the east, (he) goes back to the *koṃwmānt*, (he) goes to the *ṣuliñc* direction(?)'. If one has gone to the east and then goes back (*ṣkāṛā* "back"), one would, by logical reasoning, be going west, i.e. A *koṃwmānt* would be 'west'. Winter counters this argument by suggesting that what we are faced with here is counter-clockwise movement: going back from the east would be going north, and so considers A *koṃwmānt* to be 'north'. This is ingenious, to be sure, but not conclusive. I prefer, with Sieg & Siegling & Schulze, to take A *koṃwmānt* as 'west' and, consequently, *ṣuliñc* as 'north', primarily for the reason that I consider it established through the West Tocharian Otani text discussed above that B *oṣṣale** has the meaning 'north' rather than 'west'; one avoids contradictions by assuming that the cognate A *ṣuliñc* has the same meaning. Of course, Winter's arguments

for deriving a directional term from a word meaning mountain still applies, if one takes A *ṣuliñc* as 'north' rather than 'west'.

In short, A *ṣuliñc* 'north, northern' derives from A *ṣul* 'mountain' (cf. A *ākiñc* 'lonely' to A *āk* 'end' for a formal parallel). On the other hand, B *oṣṣale** 'in darkness, in secret' and 'direction of darkness', i.e. 'north' is derived from B *ṣale* in an earlier or an accidentally unattested meaning 'darkness' beside the attested meaning 'mountain'.

§17.1.14.3. We then come to the formal problems and possible etymological connections of these words. All previous etymological proposals, except Winter's, have separated B *ṣale* and A *ṣul* from B *oṣṣale**. All are inadequate in one way or another:

Pedersen 1941: 221 suggested a derivation of A *ṣul*, B *ṣale*, from I.-E. **selo-* / **selos-* (accounting for the East Tocharian vocalism with the remark, *l.c.*, Anm. 1, that "*l* war *u*-haltig"; the phonetics of the Tocharian phoneme /l/ deserves closer scrutiny) and connection with Gk. *ἐλος* 'marsh, low ground by rivers' (cf. also the Hesychian *ἐλη· σύνδενδροι τόποι*). This is somewhat difficult semantically, if Gk. *ἐλος* is identical with Skt. *sáras-* 'lake' as generally assumed (though rejected by Pedersen), and particularly if these Tocharian words for a mountain are cognate with B *oṣṣale**. Furthermore, if this latter connection is to be upheld, the geminate of *oṣṣale** would be left unexplained and so would the umlauted initial vocalism.

Couvreur 1950: 129 suggested an association of B *oṣṣale** ("vermutlich 'Westen, Abend'") with A *oṣeñi* 'at night' and B *wsask-* 'to dwell, stay overnight', etc., but again this would not account for the geminate -ss- nor the umlaut. Isebaert 1987: 64 proposes an identical etymology with the twist that he takes B *oṣṣale** as a loanword from East

Tocharian (an underlying Common Toch. **āwṣāl(V)-*). This takes care of the initial vocalism, but leaves the problem of the geminate. Neither proposal considers the semantic difficulties.

Van Windekens 1976: 465 associated B *ṣale*, A *ṣul*, with Lat. *silva* 'wood' and saw in B *ṣale* an I.-E. **selo-*, and in A *ṣul* an I.-E. **selu-*. Such a separation of the West and East Tocharian forms seems inadvisable, but Van Windekens explanation might be improved by positing an I.-E. **selyo-* which might perhaps yield A *ṣul* (as **(H₁)ekyo-* yielded A *yuk*) and B *ṣale* through loss of **-w-* after a resonant, as suggested by Adams (unpublished manuscript of a Tocharian dictionary), cf. B *ṣmare* 'oily, smooth' if < I.-E. **smeryo-*. If B *ṣale* and A *ṣul* 'mountain' are unrelated to B *oṣṣale**, this would appear to be a satisfactory etymology. If, however, as argued by Winter and accepted here, a relationship exists between these words, the old problems persist. Why does *oṣṣale** have an umlauted vocalism and what is the cause of the geminate? — Van Windekens' derivation of B *oṣṣale** from an I.-E. **sḷ-elo-* (to Lat. *silere* 'be quiet') is morphologically as well as semantically quite unfounded and is correctly rejected by Winter 1988: 784.

Lubotsky 1988: 91sq. derives B *ṣale* and A *ṣul* from an I.-E. **sk^welo-* (cf. OCS. *skala* 'rock, stone', etc.), and following Winter's suggestion that B *oṣṣale**, which he defines as 'in the evening', is derived from the word for 'mountain', reconstructs for *oṣṣale** a Proto-Toch. **e(n)ṣṣ^wale* < I.-E. **(H₁)n-sk^welom*. This proposal accounts for the geminate of *oṣṣale**, but disregards what may have been the basic semantic content of *oṣṣale**, i.e. 'in darkness, in secret'. Furthermore, it may be doubted that a **-w-* (or **-kw-* or **ṣ^w*) would cause rounding of a preceding **e* in West Tocharian. All alleged cases of such a rounding

are, in my opinion, rather to be seen as reflecting rounded **ä*; thus, for example, B (and A) *yok-* 'to drink' < **(H_i)eg^u-*, rather than **(H_i)ēg^u-*, cf. B *kokale* 'chariot' < **käkw-*, etc.

Winter 1988: 785, having argued for the association of B *šale*, A *šul*, with B *oššale**, proposes that a Proto-Indo-European **swelo-* would provide a fitting basis for these words, but he points out at the same time that, unfortunately, no connection can be established in Indo-European.⁹² In my opinion, however, there is a formal difficulty also, which has already been pointed out in connection with Lubotsky's proposal above, namely, the assumption of the rounding effect of **w* upon a preceding (B) **e*. There are no parallels to that in West Tocharian (cf. B *leswi* '(sudden) weakness', *spertte* 'conduct' < **spertwe*, *šertwe* 'instigation', *šerwe* 'hunter', *sekwe* 'pus', etc.), nor is **a* rounded by **w* in East Tocharian, where rounding is even more common than in West Tocharian. A second objection concerns the initial sequence I.-E. **s_uV-*. As shown above (§16.2.3), such an Indo-European sequence was in early Common Tocharian reduced to **sV-*, so that all attested instances of Tocharian *swV-* actually reflect Common Toch. **suwV-* < Proto-Toch. **su_uV-* < I.-E. **suHV-* or **suH-* in preconsonantal position (in the latter instance an anaptyctic vowel would arise following the laryngeal to yield the *-V-* of the Proto-Tocharian sequence **su_uV-*). One would then not expect original **s_ue-* to turn up in East Tocharian as *šu-* but rather as *šä-*, cf. A *šäk* 'six' < **s_uek_s*, or A *špäm* 'sleep' < **s_uepnos* (not **šupäm* as would have been expected, had **s_ue-* yielded A *šu-*, for *-u-* does not suffer syncope in East Tocharian except in the position before *-w-*).

⁹² Should one wish to pursue this idea further, a suitable etymology could actually be seen in I.-E. **s_uel(H)-* 'to burn' (Pokorny 1959: 1045) with a semantic development from 'burning' to 'burning cold, coldness' to 'cold direction (= north)' / 'cold place (= mountain)', cf. OIcel. *svalr* 'cool', MIcel. *svali* 'coolness', *svalki* 'icecold wind', etc.

§17.1.14.4. My suggestion is that the words under discussion here derive from the Indo-European root **skeu(H)-* 'to cover'. Cognates would be words such as Lat. *obscurus* 'dark', Old Irish *cúl* 'hiding place', Arm. *c'iw* 'roof, cover', Old Icel. *ský* 'cloud', *skuggi* 'shadow', etc. For word-formational reasons several Germanic cognates are of interest, viz. Old Icel. *skjól* 'cover; hiding place' < Gmc. **skeula-*, *skáli* 'room, small building' < **skawalan-*, cf. furthermore, MHG. *schülen* 'to be hidden', etc. Moreover, this root is found in the alternant form **(s)keu(H)-* 'north; rain; cold', *vel sim.*, whose meaning might be seen as deriving from a basic 'dark, darkness; overcast'. Of special interest would be OCS. *sěverŭ* 'north' (< **(s)kēu(H)ero-*), Lith. *šiaurė* 'north' (< **(s)kēu(H)(e)rijeH₂*), *šiaurys* 'northwind', Old Icel. *skúr* 'rainshower' (< **skuHreH₂*), etc., cf. Pokorny 1959: 597.

For Tocharian one has to start with the preform **skeu(H)elo-* which — after palatalization had taken place — resulted in **ššāw'ālæ*. The initial geminate was probably soon simplified and **-āw'-* yielded **-uw'-*, whereby we get **šuw'ālæ*. The fixation of the accent on the second syllable of multi-syllabic forms already in Common Tocharian may have been the cause of the reduction of this form to **šw'ālæ*. Transposing this to East Tocharian, we get A **šwāla* (depalatalization of **-w'-*) > **šula* (syncope and subsequent vocalization of **-w-*) > *šul* (apocope). The Common Tocharian preform **šw'ālæ* resulted in B **šyāle* (**-w'-* > *-y-*) > **šāle* (**šy-* > *š-*) > *šale*. The 'mountain'-meaning of B *šale*, A *šul*, can be interpreted as 'a place of cover' or 'a place of darkness' and would thus be compatible with the basic sense of the root **skeu(H)-* 'to cover'.

Also B *oššale** 'in darkness; in secret' (and 'northern') can be explained satisfactorily from this base. A quasi-preform

H₁q-skeu(H)elo-* would result in **ænşşäw'älæ* > **ænşşuw'älæ* > **onşşuw'älæ* (u-umlaut) and, assuming that the accentuation of this derivate was identical with that of the basic form **ş(ş)uwälæ*, and, furthermore, assuming that this accentuation was the cause of the reduction of the Common Tocharian sequence *-uw'- to *-w'-, this form would yield **onşşw'älæ*, which would appear as B **onşşyälæ* and finally as *oşşale. The loss of the prefixal nasal in this form can be explained in the same manner as in the word B *oşonai* 'in hate' as discussed above. While one would normally expect the nasal always to be preserved after the rounded prefixal vocalism in West Tocharian, there seems to be a limitation to that rule, namely, in the position before a double consonant or consonant cluster the dental and palatal prefixal nasal is lost.

§17.1.15. A *oşēñi* adv. 'at night' is abundantly attested, sometimes contrasting with *ykom* 'in the daytime'. It is formed with the local prefix *a-* < **æn-* affixed to a derivative of A *wşe* 'night', as seen by Winter 1952: 191. One might envisage the following development: Common Toch. **æn-w'äş-* > A **anwäş-* > **awäş-* > *oş-*, interpreting A *o-* here as the result of monophthongization.

§17.2. The denominal negative prefix:

§17.2.1. B *oñkipşe* probably has the sense 'shameless', and is so glossed by Van Windekens 1976: 216, whereas Broomhead 1962b: 156 has 'dreadful, awful, frightful, terrifying'. This word is not listed in Thomas & Krause 1964. Its exact meaning cannot be definitely gathered in its four occurrences. Twice the context is quite unclear (89 Š b1 and 622 X a2), and in 246 MQR b2 *e(rka)[tñe](tt)s[e] (ñā)k=ättsaik päst kl[y]au(tkastañä) (ś)[au]l [ñ]i oñkipşu* the emendations of Sieg & Siegling (1953: 148, ftn. 6) may not be reliable (cf. Thomas 1957: 203) — if correct, this sentence would translate: 'Vexatious now indeed have you

made my life for me, [you] shameless one!'. A fourth instance is found in Lévi S 7 a2, where Broomhead (1962b: 156) reads *ayātai(cce) oñkipše yūkoymä palsko* 'would that I overcome the unsubdued shameless spirit'. In assigning the meaning 'shameless' to B *oñkipše* one must assume that this word has been borrowed from East Tocharian, for here the word for 'shame' is *kip*, whereas in West Tocharian the corresponding term is *kwipe*. Rounding of the initial vocalism would be expected in East Tocharian in the position before **-ñkw-*, whereas no rounding would have occurred in that position in West Tocharian. The retention of the nasal of the prefix indicates borrowing before the general loss of prefixal nasals in East Tocharian.

§17.2.2. B *oñkrotstse** occurs only once: 390 MQR b3 *oñkroce* (obl. sg. masc.). Its sense cannot be gathered in its context, but it is probably equivalent to its East Tocharian counterpart *oñkrac* 'eternal, immortal'. I have previously (Hilmarsson 1986: 18, and esp. 259 = 1986a: 94) declared that these words belong to the class of privative adjectives in B *-tte*, A *-t / -c*. However, it can now be shown that this is a wrong interpretation. The privatives are formed to the verbal subjunctive stems and while no subjunctive is attested to the verb B *kwär-* 'to grow weak, old, decrepid' its attested present III (3pl. *kwremntär*) presupposes a subjunctive of class V. A privative formed to such a subjunctive ought to have had a suffixal *ā*-vocalism in both languages. It is therefore necessary to interpret B *oñkroce* as the oblique singular masculine to a possessive adjective *oñkrotstse**, which in turn is denominatively formed to a putative Common Toch. **æñk^{rā}rā* 'immortality' < **ŋ-* plus **(dh)g^{hr}-eH₂* (cf. Skt. *akṣāra-* 'imperishable', Gk. *ἀφθαρσία* 'immortality', etc, Hilmarsson 1986a: 92). The internal *-o-* of B *oñkrotstse** reflects the Indo-European feminine abstract final **-ā*

(**-eH₂*) as in e.g. B *orotstse* 'big' ← I.-E. **orā* 'hight' to the root **er-* / **or-* 'to rise, grow tall'. This internal -*o-* thereupon caused a rounding of the prefixal vocalism. There is thus no underlying **-ä-* (i.e. **-kwär-*) in *oñkrotstse** — which would have prevented the rounding — and the labiovelar has been delabialized in West Tocharian precisely because it was immediately followed by a consonant. Such a development is not contradicted by the participial form B (MQ) *kuro* < **kwärāu*, which reflects Proto-Toch. **g^hh_fH_auōs* as if from I.-E. *(*dh*)*g^hh_f-H₂-uōs* (the **-H₂-* is, of course, not radical, but simply the Tocharian preterite marker) with a vocalic **-f-* following the labiovelar; nor is it refuted by the present III (rather than II) form *kwreñuntär* 'they grow decrepid' which has replaced an originally athematic present that also had a vocalic **-f-*, cf. again my analysis of this verb 1986a.

§17.2.2.1. A *oñkrac* 'eternal, immortal' and *oñkraci* 'eternity, immortality' are well attested and their sense is secure. Although East Tocharian possessive adjectives in *-ts* generally do not show palatalization of *-ts* to *-c* in the oblique cases, it seems likely, as indicated by West Tocharian, that they have done so previously. The generalized *-c* of A *oñkrac* may be a remnant of such a flexion. As shown by the correspondence B *procer*, A *pracar* 'brother' < I.-E. **bhrātēr*, an I.-E. **ā*, through an intermediate Common Tocharian stage that I denote with **ā̃*, resulted in B *o*, A *a*. The Common Tocharian preform **æñk^hrātstsæ* resulted regularly in A **oñkrats*, obl. sg. *oñkrac*, whose initial vocalism was rounded by the labiovelar that later lost its labial factor. The reasons for the retention of the prefixal nasal in this East Tocharian word as against its regular loss in other cases is unclear. One could perhaps envisage a popular association of this word with the word A *oñk* 'man'?

§17.2.3. B *onuwaññe* adj. 'immortal, eternal'⁹³, subst. 'eternity' is a prose form alternating with the verse form *onwaññe*. The prose form is the basic one and derives from Common Toch. **æn(n)uwāññæ*. The rounded vocalism of the prefix is clearly triggered by the following *-u-*. While Van Windekens' discussion of this word in his etymological vocabulary (1976: 336-337) leaves much to be desired, his earlier explanation (1968: 411) must be right in principle — though not in detail. Thus his association with Goth. *naus*, Old Icel. *nár* 'corpse', Latv. *nāve* 'death', etc., is surely correct. Common Toch. **æn(n)uwāññæ* might then be analysed as **æn-*, the negative prefix, plus **nuwā-ñ-iyæ* < Proto-Toch. **nuH_a-n-iĵo-* < I.-E. **nuH₂-n-iHo-* 'death; mortal', and while the suffix conglomerate, productive as it is in Tocharian, might be a late creation, one may note a very similar — originally perhaps identical — formation in Celtic, viz. Old Ir. *naunae* 'famine', M.Corn. *naun* 'id.', etc., and esp. Welsh *newyn* 'id' in final **-n-(i)ĵo-*, so Hilmarsson 1986: 28.

§17.3. The deverbative negative prefix: *o(N)-* is found with B *ompakwättñe* for which, cf. §11.3, and with B *ontsoytte* for which, cf. §11.2.

§17.4. A few words in initial A and/or B *o(N)-* may be treated here although they do not or presumably do not actually have a nasal prefix:

§17.4.1. A *omäl* 'hot' is attested several times (e.g. 255 b6) and corresponds to a non-umlauted B *emalle** 'id.'. A derivative is found in A *omlyi* 'heat' (5 b4; a further derivative is A *(o)mälsune** 'heat' of 467 b2) corresponding to B *emalya* 'heat'. The etymology of these words is unclear, cf. discussion in Hilmarsson 1986: 192 with references. It is

⁹³ Well attested, e.g. 45 § a5.

therefore uncertain whether to posit a nasal prefix here at all. It will probably have to be assumed that *-m-* is the cause of the rounding in East Tocharian, although it appears that *-m-* generally does not have such an effect, cf. A *kam* 'tooth', *wram* 'thing', etc., but conversely A *ñom* 'name'. It appears that the scanty material does not allow any reliable conclusions as to whether, and under what conditions, rounding took place before *-m-* in East Tocharian.

§17.4.2. B *oñkolmo*, A *oñkalām* 'elephant' (with B *oñkolma* 'elephant cow') is abundantly attested. This is one of the most disputed words in Tocharian, cf. the recent discussion in Rasmussen 1988 who evaluates and rejects previous theories before proposing his own, i.e. a derivation from **H₂m̐bhi-k̐[H₁-maH₂* 'the servant' (cf. Gk. ἀμφί-πολος 'servant'). While Rasmussen's solution is certainly ingenious, it is fraught with difficulties on the phonological side (e.g. the internal **-k̐[H₁-* could not have resulted in A *-kal-*) and semantically one would like to have an explanation as to why the Tocharians chose to call the elephant "servant".

I have previously (Hilmarsson 1986: 198) suggested that the combined evidence of B *oñkolmo* and A *oñkalām* implies a Common Tocharian **æñkwāłmo*; furthermore, I suggested that the element B *-olmo*, A *-olām* in this word was somehow related to *-olme* of B *onolme* 'living being'. Rasmussen (*l.c.*) argues that B *-olme* could reflect I.-E. **H₂ólmo-s* 'breath' < **H₂ónmo-s* < **H₂ónH₁-mo-s* with dissimilation as seen in Arm. *holm* 'wind' (and loss of the internal laryngeal after *o*-grade of the root, cf. Gk. ὄρμος to τρῆμα from the root **térH₁-*) or in Spanish *alma* 'soul' (Lat. < *anima*). All of this could be of relevance for the Tocharian elephant words, if B *-olmo* and A *-alām* are interpreted as reflecting an I.-E. **H₂on(H₁)mōn* 'the one having breath, animal' to Rasmussen's basic **H₂on(H₁)mo-s* 'breath'. The question is then what to

make of the first element of the Tocharian words and how it combines with the second element. My suggestion is as follows. I.-E. **megH₂* 'great, much' is reflected by Toch. B *māka*, A *māk* 'much, very'. The radical vocalism has suffered lengthening in Tocharian for reasons that are unknown. Such lengthenings are not infrequent, however, cf. B *yerkwantai* (obl. sg.) vs. A *wärkänt* 'wheel', A *śanwem* (du.) 'jaws' vs. Skt. *hānu-* 'jaw', etc. That is, I.-E. **megH₂* > Proto-Toch. **mekā* > **mēkā* > Common Toch. **m'ækā* > **mākā* > B *māka*, A *māk*. From Greek we know that there was a zero grade formation **mǵ(e)H₂* as seen in Gk. *ἀγα-* in such compounds as *ἀγα-κλεής* 'having great renown', *Ἀγα-μέμνων*, etc. One could posit a Tocharian compound formation of the same type as the Greek one, i.e. a formation in **ænkā̊* < **mǵeH₂* plus **ælmo* < **ænmo* < **H₂on(H₁)mōn*. Such an **ænkā̊-ælmo* 'the big animal, great beast' contracted to **ænkā̊lmo* and assuming that *-ā̊* caused o-umlaut in the initial syllable, we get regularly B *oñkolmo* and A *oñkalām*.⁹⁴ I suggest that this Tocharian formation is a calque on some Iranian or Indic equivalent, cf. Skt. *mahā-mṛga-* 'elephant (lit. big animal)'.

§17.4.3. B *onmīṃ*, A *onmīṃ* 'repentance', with the derivatives B *onmīṃṣše*, A *onmīši* 'of regret', and B *onmissu** 'repentant', are well attested. In spite of the efforts of Van Windekens 1976: 335, who suggests an association with Skt. *mení-* 'vengeance', or Isebaert 1980: 141, who proposes an Iranian origin, the etymology of these words and their formation are quite unclear. Assuming that *on-* here is a prefix, one

⁹⁴ Or one could assume that the labial nasal of **mǵ(e)H₂* caused a labialization of the following tectal and gave a Tocharian reflex **ænkā̊*. The labiovelar would then be the cause of the rounded initial vocalism in East Tocharian, while the internal -o- would have caused the rounding in West Tocharian.

might associate BA *onmim* with the verbal root BA *mi-* 'to damage' and see in *onmim* a formation of the type B *paucim* 'renunciation, withdrawal' to the verbal root B *putk-* 'to separate'. Such an interpretation would be quite uncertain, however, and would not bring us any clue as to what has caused the rounding in the initial syllable.

§17.4.4. A *opäśśi* 'adept, able, skilful' and its derivate *opäśśune* 'skill, ability' are attested a few times (e.g. 110 b4 and 11 b3 resp.). A *opäśśi* corresponds to B *epastye*. The etymology is not quite clear, but the presence of a nasal prefix seems doubtful here, cf. Hilmarsson 1986: 178, 203, suggesting a preform **opi-stH₂-u-*.⁹⁵ Rounding of the initial vocalism in East Tocharian is, of course, caused by the following labial. Absence of rounding in West Tocharian is regular.

§17.4.5. A *opšäly* 'season, time of activity' (well attested), corresponding to B *ekšalye*, is unclear etymologically, and may, or may not, contain a nasal prefix. Although it is unclear whether the sequence A *-pš-* or the sequence B *-kš-* is original here, the labial must be responsible for the rounding in the East Tocharian form.

§17.4.6. A *osit* 'moral conduct, (Skt.) śīla' is unclear etymologically. Van Windekens 1976: 342 suggests a prefixed formation to an equivalent of Gk. ἵθύς 'straight, just, true', but that appears phonologically impossible: one would have expected a palatalized *-š-*, and there is no motivation for the rounded initial vocalism, cf. A *asināt* 'insatiable' with *a-* not *o-*. Far more plausible is Isebaert's assumption of a borrowing from an Indic source, such as **āvasīta-* 'habitus' to *āvasati* 'dwells, reposes', cf. Isebaert 1980: 148, 1981[1983]: 163.

⁹⁵ Penney 1989: 71, fn. 24, stresses the uncertainty of that derivation. It is, however, in principle accepted by Adams 1990: 84 with fn. 6.

Formations in prefixal B *e(N)*-, A *a(N)*-

§18. The normal reflex of Common Toch. **æN-* when not affected by either *ā*-umlaut, *o-/u*-umlauts or rounding through the effect of following consonants is B *e(N)*-, A *a(N)*-. Examples:

§18.1. The local prefix:

§18.1.1. B *aikne* 'duty, correct attitude', to B *yakne* 'manner', is frequently attested. It appears necessary to assume here that an originally adverbial *aikne* 'in a (correct) manner' has been substantivized in the meaning 'acting in a correct manner, correct attitude'. Formally, this word reflects an earlier prepositional phrase Common Toch. **æn + *w'äknæ*. Compounds with a nasal prefix do not follow the pattern of compound accentuation of stressing the final element of the first member. Rather, they are in West Tocharian regularly accentuated on the second syllable (if the form has more than two syllables). One might then have expected B ***eyakne*, if it were not for the rule that in a medial syllable *-yä-*, even if accented, is reduced to *-y-*, cf. Ringe 1989: 37, Hilmarsson 1989: 14.

§18.1.2. B *aiksnar* (adv.) is glossed 'around, fully' in the handbooks and equated with Skt. *sam*, *samyak* (Sieg & Siegling 1949: 100). Apparently, this word occurs only four times and its interpretation is not without problems. Thus the text 14 Š b3 *saksa šp aiksnaŕ lkäntsa[n]n* (sic, for *kl'*) renders Skt. *sukhaṃ ca rātrau svapati* with B *aiksnar* for Skt. *rātrau* 'at night'. Sieg & Siegling 1949: 23 suggest that B *aiksnar* here is an error for *kästwer* 'at night' ("graphisch leicht erklärlich"(!)), but this is rejected by Thomas 1983: 165 — surely with reason. If Skt. *rātrau svapati* is taken to mean 'he sleeps the *entire* night',

it is perhaps possible that this was translated somewhat freely with B *aiksnar* 'fully, completely'. In 349 MQR b4 we have ////(ai)ksnar paṣṣeñca which might be rendered 'observing fully, observing in a proper manner' and 156 MQ a5 *aiksnar māskentrā* renders Skt. (*sambhava*)nti 'they contain, they are full, entire(?)'. In these three occurrences it would seem more fitting to translate *aiksnar* with 'fully, completely, entirely' rather than with 'around' vel sim.; however, it would seem semantically possible that the meaning 'fully', etc., has developed from a basic meaning 'around, embracing' (assuming that *aiksnar* is related to the verb B *yāks-* 'to embrace, enclose', cf. immediately below). Only in 30 Š b1 *keṣe aiksnar wā(ntoṣ rupne swāñcaintsa ye)t(se) ysāṣṣe* would a straightforward translation of *aiksnar* with 'around' seem natural, but 'fully' would also be possible: '... (they saw) ... the golden skin on the (Buddha's) body covered fully (= all around) with rays (the breadth of) a fathom'.

§18.1.2.1. Sieg & Siegling 1949: 100 suggest an association of B *aiksnar* with B *yeksnar*, for which they suggest the meaning "etwa 'ringsherum'" (*op. cit.*, p. 157). B *yeksnar*, in their opinion, is formed to the verbal root B *yāks-* 'to cling to, embrace, enclose'. This is accepted by Krause 1952: 273, cf. also Van Windekens 1976: 591. B *yeksnar* is a hapax legomenon found in the line 30 Š b7 *pelaikneṣṣepi śpālmeṃ cakkam̐tse ṣe yerter yeksnar*. In its context this line appears to agree well with the translation 'of the excellent Dharma-wheel one (is as if) the felly around (it)' (cf. Sieg & Siegling *op. cit.*, p. 157), even though not only *yeksnar* but also *yerter* 'felly' is a hapax.

§18.1.2.2. Sieg & Siegling's association of B *yeksnar* 'around' with the verb B *yāks-* (A *yāks-*) 'to embrace, enclose' (see Adams 1989: 8sq. for a discussion of the etymology of this verb) seems reasonable.

However, the formation of *yeksnar* is problematical in three ways. Why the nasal? Why suffixal *-ar* and not *-ār*? Why the radical vocalism *-e-*? One basic assumption answers all three questions either directly or indirectly, namely, the assumption that *yeksnar* is formed to the present stem of *yāks-*. This verbal root forms a present class VI stem B *yāksānā-* (attested is *yāksana(tār)* 354 Qu a2). This answers the first question directly: the nasal of *yeksnar* is simply the nasal of the present stem.

Indirectly, it also answers the second question, i.e. that of the suffixal vocalism. It was stressed by Winter 1987: 240 that adverbial **-ār* normally carried the accent in West Tocharian and no retraction occurred (except in forms derived from the words for the decades and in B *waip̄tāyar* 'separately'). Winter therefore reasoned that B */-ar/* must represent a morphophonemic {*-arə*} (Winter's notation). One might then have expected B **yeksnār*. However, working on the assumption that *yeksnar* is formed to the present stem and in view of the attested present form B *yāksana(tār)*, it might be suggested that B *yeksnar*, occurring, as it does, in a metrical text, has been metrically shortened from an underlying (prose form) **yeksanar* (i.e. a morphophonemic {*yeksānārä*}, my notation) and that it, therefore, shows the same type of accent retraction as does B *waip̄tāyar* and the derivatives from the terms for the decades (B *p̄l̄sākar* 'by fifties', *oktakar* 'by eighties'). Winter's conclusion concerning the accentuation of the formations in **-ār* (i.e. morphophonemic {*-ārä*}, my notation) would thus be corroborated, if this analysis of B *yeksnar* is correct. This form reflects a previously quadrisyllabic **yeksnārä*.

The final question of the radical vocalism is less straightforward. The present stem, from which *yeksnar* is here assumed

to have been derived, clearly has a radical *-ä-*, viz. B *yäksänā-*. In East Tocharian no present forms are attested. One has the choice between two alternatives. First, the *-e-* is due to the influence of preterital forms with radical *-e-* in apophonic alternation with *-ä-*. The verbal root BA *yäks-* forms a preterite of class Iaß (Krause's classification of 1952 = Krause & Thomas' (1960) class II). In East Tocharian verbs of this preterite class regularly have full grade of the root vocalism in active plural forms as against zero grade in other forms, whereas in West Tocharian such an alternation has been almost completely eliminated. Rests do remain though (e.g. 3rd pl. *prautkar* vs. past ptc. *prutkau* to the verb *prutk-* 'to be locked in; to be filled with'); therefore, even if the verbal root *yäks-* bears witness only to *-ä-* and shows no traces of *-e-* in its preterite forms in either Tocharian language, it is conceivable that there may have existed normal grade forms with a radical *-e-* and that this *-e-* has for some reason slipped into the adverbial formation with the result that a putative **yäksänārä*, formed to the present stem, was replaced by **yeksnārä* through the influence of a preterite stem **yek-*. Against this alternative it may be argued that, on the one hand, there are indeed no full grade preterite forms attested in this verb, and that, on the other hand, in view of the clear affiliation of *yeksnar* with the present stem **yäksänā-*, there is no reason why a preterital normal grade vocalism — if such a vocalism existed in this verb — should have infiltrated this adverbial formation, changing **yäksänārä* to **yeksnārä*.

Thus I find the first alternative rather unlikely, although I do not maintain that it can be excluded with certainty, and, instead, I opt for the second, and following, alternative, although it is also open to criticism. I have previously on numerous occasions pointed out that there are several examples of what appears to be Tocharian reflexes of I.-E.

*ē where one would rather have expected reflexes of *e. In my works from 1986(: 273sq.) = 1987[89]a(: 66sq.) and 1987(: 46) I suggested that a few instances East Tocharian *ä*-vocalisms, to which West Tocharian corresponded with what appeared to be reflexes of I.-E. *ē, were to be understood as due to a reduction that had taken place in East Tocharian facultatively under certain conditions. However, I have since abandoned this view, cf. most recently Hilmarsson 1989: 104-105 and especially fn. 38, p. 134-135, in favour of quite the opposite: Toch. *e (from I.-E. *e), which normally yielded Common Toch. *ä, was sometimes lengthened to *ē (> Common Toch. *æ) under conditions that still remain to be defined. Such a lengthening has previously been proposed by Winter for monosyllables, viz. B *śem* 'he came' if from **g^wem-t*, but it seems clear that a lengthening occurred in di- and polysyllabic forms as well, cf. B *yerkwantai* obl. sg. 'wheel' but A *wärkänt*, or A *śanwem* 'two jaws' but I.-E. **ǵenu-* (Hilmarsson 1989: 105). One might also think of the unexpected lengthened grade vocalism of the reduplication syllable of the verbal preterite stems in both Tocharian languages. There are many further examples of this, but it would take us too far to discuss the details here or to try and find the exact conditioning factors.

In view of such lengthenings I propose that B *yeksnar* has experienced a lengthening also and derives through an intermediate **yeksänārä* from an earlier **yäksänārä*, formed to the present stem **yäksänä-* as discussed above. Support for that assumption can be seen in the form *aiksnar*, to which we shall return presently. The relationship of B *yeksnar* to B *aiksnar* is identical with that of A *škārā* 'back' to B *aškār* 'id.' (the final *-ā* of A *škārā* is simply the perlativ marker and has nothing to do with the initial *a-* < **ā-* < **ān-* < **æn-* (through *ā*-umlaut) of B *aškār* as I have previously maintained, Hilmarsson 1982/83: 160).

That is to say, B *yeksnar* reflects earlier **yāksānārā* and B *aiksnar* reflects earlier **æñ-yāksānārā*, preserving the original short vocalism.

§18.1.2.3. Closing the circle, we return now to B *aiksnar*. This form can be interpreted as having the local prefix **æñ-* (< **H_{ip}-*) prefixed to the adverb **yāksānārā*, formed as described above. The original meaning would have been 'in a round manner, in an enclosing manner, i.e. fully'. Common Toch. **æñ-yāksānārā* yielded B **eyāksānārā*, which, after the syncope of the unaccentuated *-ä-* in an open syllable and the apocope of the final *-ä*, resulted in **eyksnār* (loss of *-ä-* after *-y-*, cf. B *aikne* above and the discussion of this change there). The final and regular outcome was the attested B *aiksnar*.

§18.1.3. B *airšaitstse** adj. 'agitated, enthusiastic'. The exact sense of this word is unclear in its two(?) occurrences (viz. 124 MQR a1 *airšai*///, 362 MQ b5 *airšaicem̃n[p]ā*). However, judging by its derivate, the abstract *airšaitsñe* 127 MQR b3 'exuberance, excitement', *airš[ai]tsāññe* H add. 149. 85 a1 '(Skt.) saṃrambha' (cf. also the adjectival derivate *airšaitsāññecce* Lévi A 4 b4 'aroused, excited'; to be read thus according to Thomas 1971: 34), the adjective *airšaitstse** is probably correctly translated as here indicated.

Evidently, B *airšaitstse** is an adjective in suffixal *-tsts-* / *-cc-* to an obl. sg. **airšai*. Such an **airšai* could be interpreted in two slightly different ways. On the one hand, it could be seen as the oblique singular to a nom. sg. **airšo* or **airšiye* of Krause and Thomas' noun class VI,2 (Krause & Thomas 1960: 133-134). On the other hand, it could be seen as a prepositional phrase, that is preposition plus noun (of class VI,2) in the oblique singular, petrified as an adverb. Under both alternatives we are confronted with a sequence of a local preposition (turned into a prefix) and a noun. This noun might be seen as deriving from the verb B

yärs-, which, according to K. T. Schmidt (1969: 482sq., 1980: 407), does not have the sense ‘verehren’, but rather ‘mit innerer Beteiligung (Verehrung, Scheu, Liebe) sprechen, i.e. to speak with enthusiasm’. That is, we have here either an **airšo* / **airšiye* (obl. sg. **airšai*) from an earlier West Tocharian substantive **e(ñ)yäršo* / *-iye*, or we have here an adverbial **airšai* from B **e(ñ)-yäršai* to a substantive B **yaršo* / *(*)yäršiye* ‘(expression of) enthusiasm, agitation, (Germ.) innere Beteiligung’. Actually, there is a *hapax legomenon* H 149. add. 19 a7 *yäršiye* of hitherto unknown meaning that might support that assumption. It is found in a context where there is much talk of confessions. The line in question runs: *sthūlāñca[na] [trā]ñkonta[ts deśam] (a/ā)yi sā yäršiye* — — — ///, translated by Broomhead 1962a: 140 with “May he give the confession of the sthulāñca crimes. This *yäršiye* ...” It seems possible that *yäršiye* has the meaning ‘plea’ *vel sim.*, and could then be seen as an abstract formed to the verb B *yärs-* ‘mit innerer Beteiligung sprechen’. The formation of B *yäršiye* (/ **yaršo*), obl. sg. *yaršai**, to the verb *yärs-* is of the same pattern as, say, B *proskiye* / *prosko* ‘fear’, obl. sg. *proskai*, to the verb *pärsk-* ‘to fear’, and the adjectival formation *airšaitstse** to **airšai* is as *proskaitstse** to *proskai*. The phonological development of early B **e(ñ)-yäršai* to **airšai* is parallel to that described above (see under B *aikne*, etc.).

§18.1.4. A *akälyme*, see B *ekalymi*.

§18.1.5. A *akritär** (adj.) probably ‘round’ as suggested by Couvreur 1955-1956: 68 (“rund, voll”) and accepted by Thomas & Krause 1964: 77, rather than “(Lat.) *durus*” as suggested by Poucha 1955: 2. Attested in 217 b1 *wtsy [o]ky akritri lap* ‘head like a round parasol’, 292 a6 *wärtsāñ prākraṃ akri[t]raṃ [śan]weṃ* ‘broad, firm (and) round jaws’; also 148 a4 (bis) in an unclear context. Furthermore, this

word is found in the text PK NS 1-6, according to Couvreur (op. cit., p. 98). The masculine plural form *akritre*, cited by Thomas & Krause (*loc. cit.*), is unknown to me.

Van Windekens has proposed a plausible etymological connection for this word (1968: 412, 1976: 142), which he considers formed with what he terms "the intensive prefix *a-*" followed by **kritär* < I.-E. **(s)krit-ro-*, a derivative in **-ro-* to the root element of Lith. *āpskritas* 'round'. For semantic reasons such an association is attractive, but the details must be refined. First, A *akritär* cannot reflect a zero grade of the root. An original I.-E. **-kritro-* ought to have yielded Common Toch. **-kr'ätræ* which would have suffered metathesis to **-kär'træ* (cf. B *kälymiye*, A *kälyme* 'direction' from Common Toch. **klyäm-*, see e.g. Hilmarsson 1989: 91). That is, A *akritär* must be built on the normal grade I.-E. **-kreitro-*. Second, since stems in **-ro-* are formed to zero grade radical syllables in Tocharian (e.g. B *ratre*, A *rtär* 'red' < **H₁rudh-ro-*, B *swäre*, A *swār* 'sweet' < **suH₂d-ro-*, B *tapre*, A *tpär* 'high' < **dhub(h)-ro-*, etc.), it would seem preferable to understand A *akritär* as a formation in I.-E. **-tro-*, i.e. **-krei-tro-*, that is, the same root as in Lith. *āpskritas*, but without a dental extension (or perhaps **-kreit-tro-* with loss of the first dental in the sequence **-ttr-* as would be regular, cf. discussion in Hilmarsson 1991), cf. Pokorny 1959: 936-937 for the basis forms **krei-* and **kreit-* of identical meaning 'something round; round-about movement'. Third, instead of assuming an intensive prefix of obscure function, it would seem semantically acceptable to posit here the local prefix I.-E. **H₁q-* 'in', cf. Icel. *íbjúgur* as against *bjúgur*, both with the meaning 'bent, curved', or *ávalur* 'curved' where the local prefixes *í-* 'in-' and *á-* 'on-' seem to convey the nuance 'in the direction of (being curved)', 'in the manner of (being curved)'. That is

to say, A *akritär* < Common Toch. **æñkritræ* reflect Common Toch. **æn* + **kr'itræ* as if from I.-E. **H₁g-* plus **krei-tro-* (or **kreit-tro-*).

§18.1.6. A *añu*, see B *eñwetstse*.*

§18.1.7. A *apärkär*, see B *emparkre*.

§18.1.8. B *aurtse* adj. 'broad' is widely attested (e.g. 9 Š b6). Comparison with the less frequent B *warts(ts)e* (A *wärts*) adj. 'broad' reveals that *aurtse* must be a prefixed formation. Van Windekens (1976: 563) rejects the traditional association of these words with Skt. *urú-* 'broad', and suggests instead a derivation from I.-E. **u₂rdh-to-* 'grown' (Skt. *vr̥ddhá-*). While Adams (1988: 39) has definitely shown that the normal outcome of a sequence of two Indo-European dental occlusives in Tocharian was *-st-*, he also reckons with the possibility that Van Windekens's assertion that such a sequence ought to yield Tocharian *-tsts-* could be correct if the dentals were followed by *-j-*, i.e. B *warts(ts)e* 'broad' could reflect I.-E. **u₂rdh-tjo-* (with the usual [or at least extremely common] Tocharian replacement of **-to-* by **-tjo-*). I agree with this, but I still maintain that B *warts(ts)e* could be a cognate of Skt. *urú-* 'broad' and that that etymology is preferable, because of the perfect semantic correspondence. As suggested by Rix (apud Peters 1980: 31; cf. also Klingenschmitt 1981: 124 with note 14, Rasmussen 1989: 46 with note 34) Gk. *εβρύς* 'broad' and Skt. *urú-* reflect an I.-E. **u₂rH₁-ú-* 'broad'. That Indo-European preform would regularly result in Tocharian **wär-ä-*. I submit that this adjective was present in Common Tocharian in free use, i.e., **wärä* as well as in a prepositional phrase **æn* + **wärä* 'in a broad (manner)'. The adjective **wärä* was extended with the ubiquitous Tocharian suffix *-tstsæ*, producing the preform of B *warts(ts)e*. At the same time the prepositional adverb was extended in the same manner, producing the adjective B *aurts(ts)e* < **e(n)wärts(ts)e*. It is

possible that these extensions took place after final *-ä* had been apocopated, but that is irrelevant, for **wäräts(ts)e* would have been reduced to **wärts(ts)e* anyway (even accented *-ä-* is lost after *r* in Tocharian except after initial *r-*).

§18.1.9. B *auspa* adv. 'indeed, for sooth' is frequently attested (e.g. 23 Š a6). It is matched in East Tocharian by a non-prefixed *wäšpā* (a perlativ form), cf. B *aškār* 'back' vs. A *škārā*. In my earlier discussion of B *auspa* and A *wäšpā* (Hilmarsson 1982/83: 160) I wrongly assumed that the element A *-ā* of *škārā* and *wäšpā* was identical with the prefixal B *a-* of *aškār* and *auspa*. Of course, A *-ā* here is the perlativ final and B *a-* is a reflex of the nasal prefix. Whatever the etymology of B *auspa* it can be interpreted as reflecting an earlier prepositional phrase **æn + *wäšpā* with the meaning 'in truth'.

§18.1.10. B *ekalymi* prep.-adv. (and postpos. with genitive) 'for the sake of, in the power of, dependent on, (Skt) *vaśa-*' with derivatives such as *ekalymiññe* 'power, strength', etc., is well attested (e.g. 25 Š b6) and so is its East Tocharian pendant *akälyme* 'id.'. They are formed to the oblique singular of the noun B *kälymiye*, A *kälyme* 'direction' (obl. sg. B *kalymi*, A *kälyme*) and reflect an underlying prepositional phrase **æn + *kälým'än(än)* 'in the direction of (= under the direction of)', cf. Hilmarsson 1989: 87–93 for a recent discussion of this and other Class VI,1 substantives. The loss of the prefixal nasal is in harmony with the initial accentuation of the oblique singular form.

§18.1.11. B *elauke* adv. 'far, distantly' is to my knowledge attested only in KVāc. 30 a3 *kāse śāktālyenta skente etsuwai elauke wat* 'which seed are found near or far' (cf. K. T. Schmidt 1986: 101). This word clearly reflects an original prepositional phrase **æn + *læukæ* to a

preform of B *lauke*, A *lok*, adv. 'far', which may have been a noun originally, cf. Lith. *laukas* 'open air; field', (adv.) *lauke* 'outside'.

§18.1.12. B *emparkre* adv. 'long, fully, in detail' is well attested (e.g. 64 Š b1) and its East Tocharian pendant *apärkär* is found twice (232 b5, 238 a1). These words are clearly formed to an underlying **pärkäræ*, cf. B *pärkare*, A *pärkär* adj. 'long'. B *emparkre* and A *apärkär* thus represent an earlier prepositional phrase **æn + *pärkäre* 'in a long (manner)'. The retention of the prefixal nasal in West Tocharian is regular since B *pärkare* shows that the basis word was accented on the second syllable. Its loss in East Tocharian is, of course, also regular as the nasal is always lost in that language. The lack of rounding in A *apärkär* may indicate the previous presence of the nasal, cf. conversely B *epiñkte* vs. A *opäntäš* (see the summary [§20] for a short discussion of this phenomenon).

§18.1.13. B *emprem* adj. 'true' (subst. 'truth') is abundantly attested and has produced several derivatives: *empremtsäññe*, *empremmašse*, *emprentse*, etc. Its etymology is disputed and unclear, cf. Van Windekens 1976: 177. In my preliminary report on the subject of the present monography, delivered at the Tocharian "Tagung" of the *Indo-germanische Gesellschaft* in Berlin 1990 (Hilmarsson 1991a), I suggested tentatively that *emprem* might be cognate with OCS *pravŭ* 'true' and could possibly derive through contractions from a Common Tocharian **æn + *præwæwænän*. The retention of the prefixal nasal would then be regular, if the second part of the compound did not have initial accentuation. I still see this as a possibility. However, it had escaped my attention that Isebaert (1988: 139–140) had quite plausibly argued that B *emprem* might reflect an Iranian loanword: an Iranian **ham-γrama-* 'confidence' produced B **emprem > emprem*. Isebaert's

suggestion draws support from the fact that noun class II,2 is particularly rich in loanwords (cf. Krause & Thomas 1960: 122). It seems then that there is no need to try and accommodate B *emprēm* in the scheme of things prefixal.

§18.1.14. B *emprukšai* is a form that has recently been revealed (Pinault 1991). It is attested in PK AS 17 J b2 in the compounded form *snai-emprukšai*, translated by Pinault with "sans détour". In his paper Pinault does not comment further on this form. It is clear that *emprukšai* reflects a prepositional phrase **æn + *prukšai* 'in passing by' with an oblique singular **prukšai* to a putative nominative singular **prukšiye* 'pass, détour' to the verb B *pruk-* (non-caus.) 'to make a leap', (caus.) 'to pass over/by'. The causative of this verb forms a present of class VIII (pres. ptc. *pruksemane*, ger. I (Š) *prukšal(y)e*) which is regularly accented on the thematic vowel, i.e. has non-initial accentuation. The deverbative **prukšiye* is clearly formed to the present stem **prukšā-* and presumably had the same accentuation. The oblique to **prukšiye* was posited above as **prukšai*. However, it is likely that such a form would have retracted the accent to the first syllable, in which case the retention of the prefixal nasal of *emprukšai* would be irregular. One might therefore submit that the oblique singular was **prukšiyai* (of the type *prešciyai / preš(c)yai*) with accent on the internal syllable, and that the prepositional phrase was **æn + *prukšiyai > B *emprukšiyai > *emprukšyai > emprukšai*, whereby the retention of the nasal is regular.

§18.1.15. B *enerke* adv. 'neglectingly, hesitatingly' is to my knowledge found only⁹⁶ in PK 17. 1 a5. It is formed to (the oblique singular of) B *nerke* 'hesitation, neglect' (B 100 Š a5) to the verb BA

⁹⁶ From Bernhard 1958: 31 one gains the impression that this word might be found elsewhere.

närk- 'keep away from, abstain from' and thus reflects an earlier prepositional phrase **æn + *nærkæ* 'in hesitation'.

§18.1.16. B **(e)nešamyai* 'in evil talk' would be a more likely form than the *≈anešamyai* tentatively suggested by Sieg & Siegling (1953: 326 note 23) in 522 Š b7 *kentsanešamyai*. However, most probable is the reading *kentsa nešamyai* without a prefixal vocal in the latter word, because of the retention of the internal *-a-*, indicating an accented *-ǎ-*. B **enešamyai* or **anešamyai* are thus to be seen as phantoms.

§18.1.17. B *enestai* adv. 'in secret' is relatively well attested (e.g. 76 Š b1, 127 MQR a5, 231 MK b4, etc.). It has been analysed by Van Windekens 1976: 178–179 as a compound of a prefixal *ene-* 'in' (cf. B *enepre* 'before, facing') + **-stai* that in his opinion would be cognate with Skt. *stāyāt* 'in secret', *(s)tāyú-* 'thief', etc. Van Windekens suggests that a final **-u-* has been apocopated in the Tocharian form. – While Van Windekens' explanation might possibly be upheld on the phonological side, it completely ignores the fact that morphologically this adverb in *-ai* accords with a whole series of prefixed adverbs in final *-ai*, cf. B *amāskai*, *anaiśai*, *omotruññai**, *orkāntai*, *ośonai*, *emprukšai*, *epluwai*, *eśatkai*, *etsuwai*, etc., all of which reflect earlier prepositional phrases with a noun in *-ai*, the oblique singular final of nouns in (nom. sg.) *-iye*, *-o*. That interpretation is confirmed by a further series of prefixed adverbs in oblique singular or plural finals. It is therefore natural and indeed necessary to take B *enestai* as reflecting an earlier prepositional phrase **æn + *æstai* or **æn + *næstai*. So far our argumentation has been kept within the confines of the concrete. What follows is more speculative. I suggest that the second part of B *enestai* reflects the oblique singular to a nominative B *nesto** / *nestiye** which would be the

Tocharian *n*-stem equivalent of Gk. νόστος 'homecoming, (Germ.) Heimkehr', cf. Skt. *ásta-* 'home' (I.-E. **nes-*, Pokorny 1959: 766–767). The semantic relationship of B *enestai* 'in secret' and Gk. νόστος 'homecoming', Skt. *ásta-* 'home' would be quite parallel to that of Germ. *heimlich* 'secret', *Geheimnis* 'secret' and Germ. *Heim, Heimat* 'home'. Should this interpretation be acceptable, it would, in my opinion, support the derivation of B *nes-*, A *nas-* 'to be' from the Indo-European root **nes-* / **nos-*, because it would confirm the presence of that root in Tocharian.

§18.1.18. B *eñkatkre** adv. 'deeply' (rather than adj. 'deep') is to my knowledge attested twice (in the Berlin texts 254 MQR a3 and the almost identical 255 MQ a5 where we have *k[e]t [e]ñkätkre sanuññe šärspäm* (for *šärpšäm*) 'for whom he deeply shows enmity'. B *eñkatkre** is obviously formed to the adjective B *kätkare* 'deep', and the retention of the prefixal nasal of *eñkatkre** is to be seen in relation to the non-initial accentuation of the underlying **kätkäre*. B *eñkatkre** reflects a prepositional phrase **æn + kätkäræ* 'in a deep (manner)'.

§18.1.19. B *eñk[au]car* adv. 'loudly, officially', is, as far as I am aware of, a *hapax legomenon* attested in 25 Š b7 *auntsante weṃtsy eñk[au]car toṃ re(kauna)* 'they began to speak these words out loud'. It is clearly formed to an underlying **kaucār*, which, however, is unattested as such. The retention of the nasal in *eñk[au]car* must be seen in connection with the suffixal accentuation of **kaucār*. As shown by Winter recently (1987), superficially disyllabic adverbs in *-ār* accentuate the suffix which indicates that *-ār* reflects earlier *-ārä*. The adverb **kaucār* is derived from the adverb B *kauc*, A *koc* 'high', while *eñk[au]car* reflects a prepositional **æn + kæucārä* 'in a high [i.e. loud] (manner)'. The lack of *ā*-umlaut in the radical syllable – and therefore

also in the prefixal syllable of *eñk[au]car* – is unexpected. It could be due to the analogical effect of the unextended B *kauc* (MQ *kewc*) ‘high’; or the *-ā-* of the extension **-ārā* might be a contraction product from **-V-ārā* and the intervening *-V-* may have prevented the *ā*-umlaut from taking place.

§18.1.20. B *eñw(et)sts(e)* adv. ‘anew’ is a *hapax legomenon* apparently (5 Š b1). Although its sense clearly reflects an original prepositional use, its formation is not quite unproblematical. As basis words one might adduce either B *ñuwe* (A *ñu*) ‘new’ or B *ñwetstse* ‘new; novice’. Should *eñwetstse** derive from *ñwetstse* the nominative final *-tstse* for expected oblique *-cce* is irregular, for in a prepositional phrase one would expect an accusative or a locative to follow the prepositon, i.e. **æn + *ñuwæccæ* ‘in a new X, anew’. One might circumvent this problem by assuming that B *eñwetstse** is a late creation and was not felt to be a prepositional sequence. However, a derivation from *ñuwe* might be more propitious. Although the oblique singular of *ñuwe* is *ñuwem* with a final *-m* reflecting an *n*-stem form, a prepositional phrase would contain the oblique stem not of an *n*-stem but of the original thematic stem, i.e. **æn + *ñuwe > B *eñuwe* that produced the adjectival derivative *eñwetstse**, cf. B *emparkre* < **æn + *pärkāræ* to *pärkare* in spite of obl. sg. *pärkareṃ*, etc. – Winter (1962a: 278 = 1984: 83) suggests that A *añu* (2x; *añu* 1x) ‘cessation’ is a match of B **eñwe* of *eñwetstse**. This remains unclear though for semantic reasons. B *añu* ‘cessation’ Winter considers plausibly to be a borrowing from East Tocharian.

§18.1.21. B *epiñkte* postpos. ‘inbetween’, subst. ‘interval’ is frequently attested (e.g. 45 Š b7). It reflects a prepositional phrase **æn + *p’äñktæ* ‘in the fifth place’, that is, ‘in the middle’ in relation to the

four cardinal points (for the semantics, see Winter 1982: 401). The loss of the prefixal nasal must be seen in connection with the initial accent of the basic word B *piŋkte*. See also discussion of the corresponding A *opäntäš* in §17.1.9 above.

§18.1.22. B *eplyuwai* adv. 'afloat' is to my knowledge a *hapax legomenon* found only in M 3 a4 *eplyuwai yasarne šätkarom pälin(e) tašalona* 'leeches are to be put afloat [i.e. marinated] in blood in a *pāli* (some kind of bowl?)'. Clearly, *eplyuwai* reflects a prepositional phrase **æn + *plyuwai* to **plyuwai*, the oblique singular to *plyuwo** / *plyuwiye** 'floating' to the verb B *plu-* or *plyew-* 'to float'. The loss of the prefixal nasal matches the fact that the underlying **plyuwai* must have had initial accentuation.

§18.1.23. B *eprete* adj. 'resolute, bold' is attested several times (e.g. 241 MQ a2), cf. also the derivative *epretñe* 'resolution'. No proper basis word can be found in West Tocharian, but East Tocharian has a related *pratim* 'resolution' (presumably borrowed into West Tocharian in the form *pratim*). These words have long been associated with Goth. *frapi* 'intelligence, OIcel. *fróðr* 'knowledgeable', etc. (cf. Van Windekens 1976: 389 with lit.), and so B *-prete*, A *prat-*, have been derived from an I.-E. **prot-*, cf. also Anreiter 1984: 74–75. A different view is taken by Isebaert recently (1988: 137–139) who sees these Tocharian words as reflecting a borrowing from an Iranian **urata-* (i.e. **brata-*) 'accord, decision'. In either case the *e-* of B *eprete* would be seen as a prefixal element⁹⁷. An adjectival prefix-formation is not quite normal in Tocharian unless extended with a further suffix (*-tstse*, *-ññe* or the like): these formations are in general adverbial. This need not be a serious

⁹⁷ Van Windekens 1976: 389 sees here his "préfixe intensif", which in my view is a very misleading term. One can always glimpse the original "local" meaning of this prefix in Tocharian.

obstacle though, for it would not seem far fetched to assume that a previous adverbial formation has been made into an adjective, cf. B *ite* / *īte* 'full' (§19.1). That is, the prepositional phrase **æn + *prætæ* 'in a resolute manner, resolutely' was made to serve as an adjective 'who acts in a resolute manner, resolute'.

§18.1.24. B *eraitwe* adv. 'in connection with' is known to me only from Lévi S 4 a3. It can be seen as reflecting an original prepositional phrase **æn + *ræitwæ* 'in composition (with), in a connection (with)' and formed to the oblique singular of the deverbative noun B *raitwe* (A *retwe*) 'means; mixture, composition' to B *ritt-*, A *ritw-* 'to be bound to, connected with'.

§18.1.25. B *eśatkai* adv. 'very, (Skt.) *bhṛśam*' is attested twice in the Berlin texts (178 S a4, 375 M a4). It is formed with the local prefix added to *śatkai* (also *śitkaī*), an oblique singular to a nominative **śatko*, petrified as an adverb of the same meaning. B **śatko* would be a verbal substantive to *kātk-* 'to transgress, cross', and the prepositional phrase **æn + *śātkai* would mean 'in transgression of (= very)'.

§18.1.26. B *eše* adv., prepos.-postpos. 'together (with)' is abundantly attested (e.g. 18 Š b7). While at first sight *eše* would appear to be formed with the local prefix followed by the nominative singular masculine *še* 'one' this would contradict the concept of a prepositional phrase⁹⁸. One would expect the phrase 'in one (= together)' to contain a non-nominative. I submit that *-še* in *eše* (as well as *še-* in *šesa* 'together') reflects an original accusative form that in Tocharian has otherwise been replaced by the thematic forms B *šeme*, A *šom*, cf. Hilmarsson 1984a for a discussion of the paradigm of the numeral "one" in Tocharian. The

⁹⁸ Note that adjectives that have the ending *-m* in the oblique singular in general do not show this element in the prefixed formations, cf. B *emparkre* to *pārkare*, obl. *pārkareṃ*. This is not because the prefixed formation derives from the nominative form, but rather because it is derived from the non-*n*-stem oblique.

Indo-European form behind *še** in *eše* and *šesa* would have been the masculine accusative singular **sēm-ŋ* < **sem-ŋ* (or possibly a locative **sēm*).

§18.1.27. B *ešerñāna* f.pl. 'the sisterly ones' is attested in 107 S a5, b3, 6. B *šer*, A *šar* 'sister' reflects Commno Toch (obl. sg.). **šāsær-ām* < I.-E. **suesor-ŋ*. To B *šer* there would have been an adjective **šerñe* 'sisterly' < **šāsær(ä)ññæ*, from which derives the prepositional phrase **æn + *šāsær(ä)ññæ* 'in a sisterly (manner)', yielding B **ešerñe*. This phrase was in turn substantivized, yielding (the feminine plural) B *ešerñāna* 'those who are in a sisterly way'.

§18.1.28. B *etrīwaitstse** adj. 'mixed' is to my knowledge a *hapax legomenon* found in Lévi K 2 (= PK AS 7 B) a5 in the form of a neuter genitive plural *etrīwaitsānaṃts*. For this reading rather than Lévi's *(te)trīwaitsānaṃts*, see Pinault 1989: 193 and 217 note 18. This adjective derives from an adverbial **etrīwai*, originating from a prepositional phrase **æn + *trīwai* 'in a mixture', with **trīwai* the oblique singular to a substantive **trīwo / *triwiye* 'blend, mixture' (cf. B *traiwo* 'id.') to the verb B *triw-* 'to mix'.

§18.1.29. B *etsarkle* prep.-adv (attested Lévi A 1 b7) is translated by Thomas & Krause 1964: 174 with "mit Eifer". Broomhead 1962b: 58 has "mortification, castigation, flagellation" and equates *etsarkle* with Skt. *ātāpa-* (cf. Skt. *ātāpana-* '(self)castigation'), which appears reasonable in view of the meaning of the verbal root B *tsārk-* 'to burn, torture' (*etsarkle* would be based on a gerundive to that verb) as well as in view of the derived adjective *etsarkälletstse* of Lévi U 2 a3 which translates Skt. *ātāpina-* 'ascetic, practising flagellation'. It is then possible to see B *etsarkle* as reflecting a prepositional phrase **æn +*

**tsärkällæ* ‘in castigation’ *vel sim.* It is not unlikely that *etsarkle* is a sort of calque on the Indic base *ā-tāp-*.

§18.1.30. B *etsuwai* prep.-adv. ‘unto, towards, (Skt.) upa’ is well attested (e.g. 11 Š a8). It is formed with the local prefix added to the also attested, but less frequent, B *tsuwai* ‘id.’, the oblique singular to a putative nominative **tsuwiye* (rather than **tsuwo* as proposed by Van Windekens 1976: 538, for here one would have expected umlaut of the radical **-u-*, cf. B *cowai* to a nominative **cowo* ‘±theft’ < **cuwo* < I.-E. **teup/bhōn* [Gmc. **þjuba-z* ‘thief’], Hilmarsson 1991b). The putative **tsuwiye* would be a deverbative noun to BA *tsu-* act. ‘to join, fit’, mid. ‘to adhere, cling to’, and the prepositional phrase **æn + *tsuwai* would mean ‘in a joint (with) [= unto]’.

§18.1.31. B *eweta* prep.-adv. ‘in conflict with’ is found a few times (68 Š b2, 176 M b7, M 3 a7, St. a. b1). It represents an original prepositional phrase **æn + *wætā* ‘in a conflict’ to the oblique singular B *weta* of a putative *weto** ‘fight, conflict’ (a feminine of noun class VI,3) to the verb *wät-*, *wet-* ‘to fight’. Broomhead 1962b: 59 lists the adjective *ewetaistse* as found in the nominative plural form *ewetaicci* of PK 17. 10 a6. One may doubt the authenticity of this form and suspect a wrong reading for *ewetacci*, unless *-aicc-* here is of the same kind as that of the privative *ayātaicce*, etc., i.e. due to a “colloquial” change of *-a-* to *-ai-* before a palatal, cf. K. T. Schmidt 1986: 638 for the “colloquial” change of B *-a-* (< **-ä-*) to *-ai-* in such environment. In either case, B *ewetaicci* for *ewetacci** would be an adjective in *-tstse* formed to the adverbial *eweta*.

§18.2. The negative prefix:

§18.2.1. A *añśār / aṃśār*, see B *eñcare*.

§18.2.2. B *empelle* adj. ‘terrible, with its abstract derivative

empelñe, is well attested (e.g. 255 MQ a6). The matching A *empele* 'id.' is a borrowing from West Tocharian. As seen by Krause & Thomas 1960: 55, B *empelle* is to be associated with B *pele* 'law; dharma', and thus has developed from 'lawless' to 'terrible'. In my opinion B *empelle* reflects an earlier **empeliye* (cf. the obl. sg. masc. *empelye*, fem. *empelyai*) and thus rests upon a **peliye* 'of the law' (*vel sim.*), a derivative of B *pele*, negated through the negative prefix. The retention of the prefixal nasal is due to the second syllable accentuation of the of the underlying form.

§18.2.3. B *eñatketstse** adj. 'unsupported(?)' is attested in H 149. 4 (= HMR 2) a1 and its duplicate H add. 149. 84 a2: *sañkik raktsisa šamānentse eñatketse mā ceppille mā wsasšälle* 'on a community blanket a monk is not to step [and] not to lie [if] unsupported'. The exact translation of *eñatketstse** is uncertain, cf. Couvreur 1954a: 45 note 5 who suggests 'not sick'. The only association viable for this word within Tocharian is with the verb B *nātk-* 'to support' as suggested by Krause 1952: 253.

§18.2.4. B *eñcare* adj. 'not dear, unlovable' is well attested (e.g. 20 Š a8). There are two correspondences of this word in East Tocharian. One is A *eñcare* which must be a borrowing from West Tocharian as seen by the retained final -e and the internal -a- from B -ǎ-. The other is A *añśār / aṃśār* which, according to Winter (1980[81]: 126–127)⁹⁹, is wrongly rendered with 'weak, heavy' in the handbooks (e.g. Thomas & Krause 1964: 77, Van Windekens 1976: 145). For Winter, A *añśār / aṃśār* is the regular East Tocharian match of B *eñcare*. This is probably correct, for A -ñc- often appears as -ñś- or -ṃś-. The lack of epenthesis (i.e. one might have expected A **aiñcār < *e(ñ)cār*) could be only

⁹⁹ Cf. also Gippert 1979: 271 with note 7.

apparent, for as will be seen immediately below, this word has suffered haplology. B *eñcare* (and in a parallel manner A *añsär* / *aṃsär*) is formed by adding the negating prefix to Common Tocharian preform of the adjective B *ciñcare* / *cäñcare* 'dear' and in the process one syllable has been haplogically lost, i.e. **æñ-cäñcáræ* resulted in **æñcäre* (cf. already Lane 1938: 36). The nasal of *eñcare* represents the nasal of the underlying adjective but not that of the prefix. The *-i-* of B *ciñcare* is the result of the influence of the palatal environment upon *-ä-*, while A *ciñc-* (50 times as against *cäñc-* twice) results from *i*-epenthesis before *-ñc-* in that language.

§18.2.5. B *enersänk* adv. 'unheedingly, inadvertently' is attested in 154 H b3 (= H 149. 22 b3 = 153 MQ a1) and PK 15 A a6 (according to Broomhead 1962b s.v.). Van Windekens' (1976: 178) association of this word with the verb BA *närk-* 'to keep away from, abstain from' is clearly wrong, for the basic unprefixated *ersänk* 'careful, attentive' is attested in 589 Š b5 and presumably in 242 MQ a1, cf. also Y 1 b5 *ersänkñe* 'care, attention, precaution'. B *enersänk* is simply 'un-attentive', cf. my discussion of the line 154 H b3 in Hilmarsson 1990[91]: 97.

Formations in prefixal **yǎ(N)-*

§19. The full grade to the Indo-European local prefix **H₂ǵ-* was **H₂en(-)* which may have been a free form originally used as a preposition. In Tocharian its reflex (Common Toch.) **yǎn-* functions in quite the same way as **æn-*, the reflex of I.-E. **H₂ǵ-*. Toch. **yǎn-* suffers no umlauting or rounding effects but the nasal is retained or lost under the same circumstances as the nasal of the other prefixes.

Consequently, the vowel (-ä-) of the prefix is lost if unaccented (whether the syllable is open or closed). Examples:

§19.1. B *ite* / *īte*¹⁰⁰ indecl. adj. 'full, complete' is abundantly attested (e.g. 46 Š a3). In East Tocharian *ypic* / *ywic* 'id.' is generally considered related to B *ite* / *īte* but this relationship has not been correctly defined. Thus, Van Windekens 1976: 607 assumes A *ypic* / *ywic* is a prefixed formation, while B *ite* is not. He derives both from an I.-E. **uītos* to the root **ueiH-* 'to strive after, pursue' which is not semantically enlightening. He does not define the phonological development envisaged. – The following explanation of these forms might be proposed: The underlying Indo-European form is **uīto-s* < **ui-H_i-to-s* (prefix **ui-* and past participle to **Hei-* 'to go') as found in Germ. **wīda-z* 'wide' (Oicel. *víðr*, OHG *wīt*, etc.). This form would in Common Tocharian yield **w'itæ* with a palatal initial **w'-* because the reflex of an I.-E. **ī* caused palatalization of Tocharian **w* as seen by the word for 'twenty'¹⁰¹: I.-E. **uīkmt* < **(d)ui-dkmt* resulted in Common Toch. **w'ikānt* as found in B *ikām*, A *wiki*. Further development of Common Toch. **w'itæ* would be to B **yite* > *ite* / *īte*. This West Tocharian form could thus reflect a non-prefixed formation as proposed by Van Windekens. A more satisfying solution would be to see both the East and the West Tocharian forms as identical. This is possible, if one posits an original prepositional phrase **yān + *w'itæ* 'in a wide manner, widely = fully'. This would result in B **yāyite* > *ite* / *īte*, and A **yāwita* > **ywit*. An oblique singular would have had a palatalized suffix, cf. the

¹⁰⁰ The written length of *i* (as well as of *u*) in Tocharian is irrelevant for etymological purposes. It is possible that it has something to do with accentuation, but the distribution is not quite identical with that of B *ā* and *a*.

¹⁰¹ At present I assume the following chronological order with regard to palatalization: 1. I.-E. **i* (and **u*) became Toch. **ā* after *w* and after a tectal; 2. palatalization; 3. I.-E. **e* > Toch. **ā*, I.-E. **ī* > Toch. **i*, I.-E. **i* > Toch. **ā* (in environments other than mentioned under 1).

nom. sg. masc. **-ttæ* vs. the obl. sg. masc. **-ccæ* of the privatives. A *ywic* and its variant *ypic* simply represent the oblique singular of the adjective matching B nom. sg. *ite / ĭte*.

§19.2. B *yapoy* n. 'land' (pl. [central dialect] *ypauna*, [eastern dialect] *ypomna*) is frequently attested, cf. also derivatives such as B *ypoye* adj. 'rustic, country', etc. It is matched by A *ype* (pl. *ypeyāntu*). In my study of this word (1988) I suggested that it reflected a compounded Indo-European or Proto-Tocharian creation **(H₁)en-bhuH₂-i*, a neuter *i*-stem. It appears that, while accepted by some, this – in my opinion – rather attractive etymology has not aroused general enthusiasm. Adams (1990a: 72–77) offers very constructive criticism, and thereupon suggests a different etymology.¹⁰² Adams' critique is twofold and – in my opinion – to some extent justified. That does not necessarily mean that the etymology is wrong though, but rather that it has to be modified accordingly. First, Adams finds that the loss of the prefixal nasal in the suggested (late) PIE or early Proto-Tocharian compound **enbhuHi* is unacceptable as there was no word boundary between **en-* and **-bhuHi*, while the nasal loss in adverbial constructions such as B *yparwe*, etc., could have occurred before the univerbation of preposition and noun, and could thus be viewed as a loss of a word-final nasal. This argument is not necessarily probative, for we find both loss and retention of the prefixal nasal in the deverbative privatives (cf. B

¹⁰² I cannot accept Adams' etymology. He suggests a formation with a prefixed **ep-* followed by a Tocharian cognate of Hitt. *utnē* 'land', Gk. *οὔρα* 'surface of the earth, ground; pavement, floor', etc. This is, of course, semantically impeccable; furthermore, his derivation of the plural B *ypauna* / *ypomna* from **ep-oudneA* is acceptable. For Adams' (western dialect) plural *ypeuna*, see comment in text below. His derivation of the singular B *yapoy* from **ep-ouden* is not acceptable to me. The internal **-de-* ought in Tocharian to be represented by **-sä-*. I do not accept that the palatalizing factor of **-e-* > **-ä-* could develop into a fully-fledged **-y-* before which the **-d-* was lost. Should one then prefer to see the singular as formed analogically to the plural, one runs into insurmountable difficulties with the *-o-* and the *-y* of B *yapoy*.

*ekatkatte** vs. B *enkarstatte**, etc.) and in the negated denominatives (cf. B *aknātsa* vs. *empelle*), where the nasal ascertainably was never word-final. It seems that there were specific rules for the loss or retention of the nasal in prefixes, as argued in the present work, which did not apply in non-prefixed formations. The loss of the nasal in B *yapoy* could therefore be regular in spite of Adams' misgivings. Second, Adams finds the assumption the B *yapoy*, A *ype*, reflect a neuter *i*-stem unsatisfying. I agree with that. I am of the opinion now (cf. 1991a) these words actually reflect an earlier prepositional phrase of **H₁en* + noun in the locative singular, i.e. **H₁en* + **bhuH₂-i* (cf. A *ynālek* 'elsewhere' < **yān* + (I.-E.) **al₁oi+*, as argued below). This preform yielded Tocharian **yān* + **pwā-y* 'in the land' that was later substantivized and came to be used simply as a designation for 'country, land', cf. the name of the city *Istanbul* which is an old prepositional phrase 'in the city'. Common Toch. **yān* + **pwāy* yielded B *yapoy*, A *ype* regularly, as described in my paper from 1988 (B **āy* > *oy*, cf. B *soy* 'son' < **swāyā*, opt. marker *-oy-* < **-āy-*). The loss of the prefixal nasal must be seen in connection with the original seat of the accent on the first (and only) syllable of **pwāy*. When **yā(n)-pwāy* finally had merged as a compound, the accent was retracted to the first syllable of this disyllabic form as would be expected, yielding B *yapoy*. In the plural, A *ypeyānt* still reveals the diphthong (A *e* < **āy*) before the plural marker, while in West Tocharian *ypauna* (eastern *ypomna*) seems to have monophthongized the diphthong in the position before the plural suffix (cf. similarly B pl. *śāmna* to sg. *śaumo* 'human being'). This interpretation does not take account of the plural form *ypeuna* which Adams (1990a: 76) sets up as a western dialect form of West Tocharian. This form is unknown to me, and as far as I can see it does not occur in the Berlin texts nor in the London texts.

§19.3. B *yästār** / *istār* adv. 'doubly' is attested in 404 Š b1 where *y[ā]s[n]ā* – is emended by Sieg & Siegling (1953: 269 note 8; cf. also Thomas 1957: 119) to *y[ā]s[t]ā(r no)*, and in the form *istār* in H 149. add. 122 b4. It is likely that this word is to be associated with B *wasto*, A *wäst* adv. 'double' < I.-E. **duis-to+*, but the initial *yä-* for expected *yu-* is strange. A prefixed formation derived from an earlier prepositional phrase **yän + *wästārä* ought to have resulted in B **yāwästārä* > **yustār*. It seems that one would have to assume either simply a loss of the internal *-w-* or an assimilation *y...w* to *y...y*, whereby the forms *yästār** and *istār* could be reached. Neither is a happy choice. It is perhaps simplest to assume that B **yāwästārä* yielded **ywästār* through syncope and apocope, and that in this form the initial cluster **yw-* was reduced to *y-*.

§19.4. A *ylaṅkaṃ* adv. 'pending, hanging loose' is attested twice (218 a8, 253 b2). It is of considerable interest, for its second part *-laṅkaṃ*, to A **laṅk* matched by B *leṅke* 'precipice, (Germ.) Abhang' [e.g. *šlyīye leṅke* 'mountain precipice'], appears to be a noun in the locative case. It appears then that A *ylaṅkaṃ* reflects an earlier prepositional phrase, consisting of the preposition **yän* with locative rection followed by the locative (Common Toch.) **læṅkæ-næ*. The noun **læṅkæ* would have been an abstract noun 'hang, (act of) hanging' to the verb *lāṅk-* 'to hang', and **yän + *læṅkæ-næ* had the literal meaning 'in (the act of) hanging loose'.

§19.5. B *yñakteṃ* / *iñakteṃ* prep.-adv. 'among gods' is abundantly attested (e.g. 23 Š a1). It is obviously the reflex of a prepositional phrase **yän + *ñākteṃ* 'in (i.e. among) gods' with *-ñakteṃ* the oblique plural of B *ñakte* 'god'.

§19.6. B *yñkaṃ* / *iñkaṃ* adv. 'by day' is attested some five

times in the Berlin and Hoernle texts (e.g. 33 Š b1) and presumably several times in the Paris texts. It corresponds to A *ykoṃ* 'id.', also well attested. It clearly derives from B *kaum*, A *koṃ* 'day, sun', and thus reflects an original prepositional phrase **yān + *kaum* 'in the daytime'. The retention of the prefixal nasal in West Tocharian is problematic in view of the theory being defended here that such a nasal survived before *k* (and *p*) in that language only if the second part of the compound did not have initial accent. B *kaum* and A *koṃ* are monosyllabic and would seem to contradict that theory. However, it is evident that *kaum* / *koṃ* cannot reflect an originally monosyllabic form: on the one hand, the final nasal presupposes some following element, and on the other hand, the non-initial accentuation of B *yñkaum* / *in̄kaum* presupposes an earlier trisyllabic form or more. There is therefore at least a theoretical possibility that the preform of *kaum* / *koṃ* was not initially accented. The solution of the nasal problem here centers around the origins and etymology of *kaum* / *koṃ*. Van Windekens 1976: 626–627 discusses (and dismisses) several earlier attempts at etymological explanations of this word, opting himself for a Turkic origin. In my opinion, however, B *kaum* and A *koṃ* are indigenous. Winter's suggestion (1984: 35–37) of a connection with Gk. *καίω* 'set fire to, kindle' (originally proposed by Smith 1911: 10) and therefore a derivation from **kāwn-* is certainly attractive, but does not help us with the problem of *yñkaum* / *in̄kaum*, for a putative accusative singular **kāun-ṃ* would yield an initially accented form. This will not be emended, even if one operates with an accusative **kāyon-ṃ*, cf. again below. – In a preliminary report delivered at the Tocharian "Tagung" of the *Indogermanische Gesellschaft* in Berlin (September 1990; = Hilmarsson 1991a) I proposed the following explanation: "Engl. *heat*, Germ. *Hitze*, etc., have relatives

without a dental extension in OHG *hei* 'dry', *gihei* 'heat, dryness', *arheigētun* 'they dried up', cf. also the Gothic *s*-stem (dat. pl.) *haizam* 'torches'. OHG (*gi*)*hei* reflects an I.-E. **kaiH₂O-* (perhaps a secondarily formed full grade to a metathesized zero grade **kiH₂-* to an original full grade **keH₂i-*). By taking this I.-E. **kaiH₂O-* 'heat,' and adding to it the possessive suffix **-y_{en}- / *-y_{on}- / *-un-*, we get **kaiH₂O-y_{ōn}* 'the one endowed with heat, the one of scorching heat', which the Tocharians may have seen as an appropriate name for the sun in their desert environment. The Tocharian forms can be seen as based on the zero grade of the suffix. Thus, e.g., a nom. pl. **kaiH₂O-un-es* would yield Common Toch. **kāyæuñä* which suffered contraction to **kauñä* and acquired the *i*-stem nom. pl. marker *-i* (from **-ejes*), viz. *kauñi*, in the same manner as the word for 'earth' (A pl. *tkañi*). The form B *kaum* (as B *kem* 'earth') must reflect an old accusative form, i.e. I.-E. **kaiH₂O-un-*m** > Common Toch. **kāyæunän* > **kāunän* (contraction) > B *kaum*, A *kom*".¹⁰³ Through such an interpretation of B *kaum*, A *kom*, we see that this word can have been trisyllabic at the time of the univerbation of the preposition and the noun. If the accent was on the internal syllable, the resulting *yñkaum* < **yän* + **kāyæunän* would have a regularly retained nasal. Winter's connection with Gk. *καίω* could not be upheld in a parallel manner, for *kāwænän* (< I.-E. **kāy-on-*m**) would result in **kām* not *kaum*.

§19.7. A *ynālek* adv. 'elsewhere' is attested some five times. It is composed of the local prefix **yän-* followed by some form of or derived from the pronominal adjective A *ālak* (B *alyek / allek*). It is hard to see,

¹⁰³ For such a contraction, cf. B *naunto** 'road' (obl. sg. *nauntai*), where an I.-E. **noiH₂O-unt-ōn*, an individualizing *n*-stem formation to a *yent*-derivative of a thematic **noiH₂O-* to the root **neiH₂-* 'lead' (cf. Skt. *nīthā* 'road'), through Common Toch. **næyæuntōn* and contraction to **næunto*, resulted in B *naunto** (Hilmarsson 1989: 25–26).

however, what form of this pronominal adjective the second half *-ālek* represents. The regular paradigm of A *ālak* has a form in final *-ek* in the nominative plural masculine only and it would be highly irregular to have **yān-* compounded with a nominative form. Apparently, this difficulty led Van Windekens (1976: 161; cf also Bernhard 1958: 228 note 2) to assume that A *ynālek* was borrowed from West Tocharian (even though no such or equivalent form is found in that language), pointing to the stem B **āle-* of *aletstse* 'strange, unknown', or obl.sg. masc. *alyek / allek*. I prefer to see in A *ynālek* an archaism reflecting a prepositional phrase of **yān* plus an original locative singular **āllæi(-kā)* from I.-E. **aljoī* and therefore meaning 'in another (place)'.

§19.8. B *ynāñm* adv. 'with dignity' is well attested (e.g. 24 Š a3) and its equivalent A *ynāñm* is also secure. Cf. also derivatives such as B *ynāñmāññe*, A *ynāñmune* 'dignity'. BA *ynāñm* reflects an earlier prepositional phrase **yān* plus the oblique singular **āñmä* to B *āñme* (obl. *āñm*), A *āñcām* (obl. earlier **āñm*, cf. the locative singular *āñmam*) 'self, (Skt.) ātman'. The precise course of the semantic development is not quite clear to me, but there is no reason to doubt that **yān + āñmä* 'in a dignified (manner)' pertains to B *āñme*, A *āñcām* 'self'.

§19.9. B *ynaṣak* adv. 'before', attested in Lévi S 4/882 b5, and its derivative *ynaṣkak* 'id.' attested in 313 MQR a1, are formed to the adv./adj. B *naṣ* 'earlier, previous', clearly based on an underlying prepositional phrase **yān + naṣ* 'in previous (times)', *vel. sim.*

§19.10. B *ynes* adv. 'evidently, manifestly' is abundantly attested (e.g. 41 Š a2), and so is A *ynes* 'id.' which is borrowed from West Tocharian. B(A) *ynes* reflects a prepositional phrase **yān + eśä* '(lit.) in the eyes' with **eśä* being the (oblique) dual of B *ek* 'eye'.

§19.11. B *yparwe* adv. 'first, at first' (with the derivative adjective *yparwetstse*) is well attested (e.g. 21 Š a6). It is obviously formed to B *parwe* adv. 'first, firstly' and reflects an original prepositional phrase **yän + *pärwæ*. The loss of the prefixal nasal is regular in view of the initial accentuation of the underlying *parwe*.

§19.12. A *ysalu* adv. 'in comfort, easily' is attested twice, 246 b6, 355 a1, plus a third time 246 b4 where a truncated *ysa///* presumably stands for *ysalu* and translates the preceding Skt. *kṣamena* 'with comfort'. For this meaning and not Poucha's "omnino", cf. Couvreur 1955-56: 70). It is formed as an adverbial phrase **yän + *sælwæ* 'in wholeness' to the preform of A *salu* 'complete'.

§19.13. B and A *ysamo*, see B *ysomo*.

§19.14. B *ysape* / *isape** adv. 'near, nearby' (in approximately the same meaning but with extensions in **-ār*: *ysapar* / *isapar*, [perlative] *ysaparsa*, < **yäsāpārā*, and in **-kä*: *ispek* < **yäsāpé-kä*) is frequently attested (e.g. 78 Š a3). It is formed with the local prefix or here perhaps rather the local adverb **yän* 'in' added to the adverb B *sape* / *spe* 'near'. This latter word derives from I.-E. **supo* (Gk. *ὑπό* '(in) under', Skt. *úpa* 'close up to', etc., cf. already Pisani 1942-43: 29). For the collocation of **yän* 'in' and *sape* '(originally) under' = 'near, close to', cf. Icel. *innundir* 'close unto' from *inn* 'in' and *undir* 'under'.

§19.15. B *ysomo* adv. 'altogether' is well attested (e.g. 42 Š a7). It has been borrowed into East Tocharian (A *ysomo* 'id.'). This word is formed to the oblique singular feminine (possibly originally neuter) of the cardinal numeral "one" (B *somo*); that is, it constitutes an original prepositional phrase **yän + *somo* (< **sæmā*) 'in one'. West Tocharian has one instance of *ysamo* 'id.' which may reflect earlier **yän + *sāmo*, but the text in which it is found (343 MQ b6) is fragmentary and corrupt

and the form may not be reliable. On the other hand, A *ysamo* (attested twice: 371 a2, 410 a2), being a borrowing from West Tocharian, would seem to confirm the authenticity of B *ysamo*. It is possible that **sāmo* is a cross between the West Tocharian nominative singular feminine *sana* and the oblique *somo*. For a detailed discussion of the Tocharian numeral “one”, see Hilmarsson 1984a.

§19.16. B *yśāmna* / *isāmna* prep.-adv. ‘among human beings’ is well attested (e.g. 14 Š a2). It reflects a prepositional phrase **yān* + **śāmna* ‘in (i.e. among) human beings’ with B *-śāmna* the oblique plural of *śaumo* ‘human being’.

§19.17. A *yusār* is by the handbooks given the meaning ‘always anew’, cf. Thomas & Krause 1964: 130; also Sieg 1944: 26 with note 8. However, at the Berlin Tocharian Conference of the *Indogermanische Gesellschaft* in September 1990, K. T. Schmidt produced evidence that A *yusār* actually means ‘spring’ or ‘in the spring’. Schmidt’s analysis of this word as a prefixed formation to a form reflecting I.-E. **uesōr* ‘spring’ or the like is bound to be correct. That is, A *yusār* reflects a prepositional phrase **yān* + *w’āsār* ‘in spring’.

§19.18. B **ywār* ‘half, middle’ is not found in free use, but as the first half of a compound it can be seen in B *ywārttaś* ‘commander of the central region’¹⁰⁴ (found in LP 3 a1, 5 a1 [Lévi 1913a: 312], 29 a1, see Pinault 1987). B *ywārc* (adv., prepos., subst.) ‘half, inbetween’ is to be seen as an allative in *-śc > -c* to **ywār*. The adverb B *ywarca* listed in the handbooks (Krause & Thomas 1964: 230, cf. also Van Windekens 1976: 612) is non-existent. This form is only found in compounds, e.g. H 149. X. 5 a2 *artsaywarcameñ* ‘every half month’, 65 Š b8 *ywarcīši*; compounds are regularly accented on the last syllable of their first part,

¹⁰⁴ In the interpretation of Winter 1897: 240–242. The discussion here rests in all its main points upon that of Winter.

i.e. here **-yāwārcā-meñä* > *-ywarcameñ*, and **yāwārcā-yäši* > *ywarcīši*. B *ywārtsa* adv. 'half' is a perlativ to **ywār*, while B *ywārcka* / *ywārška* reflect *ywārc* extended with the particle **kā*. A *ywārckā* / *ywārškā* are borrowed from West Tocharian: Van Windekens 1976: 612–613 is wrong in maintaining that the borrowing was the other way around. – The basis of all these forms is thus B **ywār* which is most naturally to be seen as having a prefixal *y-* added to some form of the word for "two" with the distributive final *-ār*. Van Windekens (*l.c.*) takes the *-w-* to reflect I.-E. **du-* followed by the distributive suffix, while Winter 1987: 241 sees the *-w-* as a reflex of the masculine form of the numeral "two", which otherwise has been lost in West Tocharian but in all probability ought to have been **u* (i.e. from **(d)wō*). At all events it is clear that **ywār* represents a form of the distributive numeral for "two" prefixed by the local **yān-*. Its meaning is thus to be seen as 'in (between) the two parts' → 'in half; half', but not necessarily 'in(between) groups of two (parts) each' as suggested by Winter (*l.c.*), cf. Icel. *í tvennt* 'in two parts' to *tvennur*, the distributive numeral "two".¹⁰⁵

§19.19. B *yweru* / *iweru* 'dropsy, (Skt.) śoṭha' (attested 255 MQ a2 [loc. sg.] *iweru-ne* and Y 3 a2 *yweru*) must be formed to B *weru* 'blister (full of water)'. This latter word, which presumably is a neuter (cf. B *keru* 'drum', pl. *kerunta*) I would derive from as if an I.-E. **ḡodr-uḡt-* 'having water'. It might then be submitted that B *yweru* / *iweru*, reflecting **yān* + **wæruw-* could be translated literally 'in (what) contains water' or 'in blister(s)' and that a word meaning "sickness", or the like, has been omitted, i.e. '(a sickness) in (= of) blisters'.

¹⁰⁵ I do not share Pinault's doubts (1988: 202 with note 48) concerning the semantic side of deriving B **ywār* 'half; middle' from a basic meaning 'in two parts'; while e.g. Icel. *í tvennt* or *í tvennu lagi* 'in two parts' can refer to two unequal parts, its usual reference is to two equal parts and therefore a division in two halves.

Summary of main conclusions

§20. This study has been concerned mainly with two problems of Tocharian grammar: first, the formation of words containing nasal prefixes, and second, the phonological form of the nasal prefixes. The conclusions can be summarized as follows:

§20.1. The privatives are formed to the subjunctive stem of their respective verbs exclusively. Denominative formations with the local prefixes (Common Toch.) **æn-* or **yän-* are principally to be seen as reflecting original prepositional phrases, locutions of preposition plus noun in an oblique case. Usually this oblique case is the accusative (Tocharian oblique) but in a few instances it reflects a locative (B *yapoy*, A *ype*, A *ynālek*, A *ylañkam*, [possibly] B *eše*). In one instance a prefixed verb is found: B *ānāsk-* 'to inhale'.

§20.2. The problems of the phonological form of the nasal prefixes are twofold. On the one side there is the question of the development of the vocalism of Common Toch. **æn-*, while on the other side there is the question of the loss or retention of the nasal of Common Toch. **æn-* and **yän-*.

§20.2.1. The vocalism, Common Toch. **æ-* which normally yields B *e-*, A *a-*, can be affected by *ā*-umlaut or back-umlauts (*o*-umlaut, *u*-umlaut, rounding through following consonant(s)). The umlauting processes operate in both Tocharian languages but partly under divergent conditions. Thus, *ā*-umlaut operates unconditionally in West Tocharian, while in East Tocharian it operates only in those syllables that – judging by the West Tocharian material – were unaccented. Rounding through following consonant(s) is effected in East

Tocharian before a following **kw* (*oñkrac*, *oñkalām* [not really with a nasal prefix], B *oñkipše* [loanword from A]), *p* (*opäntäš*, *opärkā*, [cf. the same type of rounding in *opäšši*, *opšäly*, *opyāc* that do not have a nasal prefix]) and possibly before *m* (*omäskem*, *omäl*), while in West Tocharian such rounding takes place only before *mp* (*ompakwättñe*, *ompalsko*, *ompalskoññe*, *ompostām*, *omprotärtstse**, *oppīlom* [if *-pp-* < *-mp-*]). AB *onmīm* is unclear. The *o*-umlaut is seen in A *oklop*, B *omotruññaišše*, *ośonai*, *ontsoytte*, *oñkor*, *oñkolmo* [not really with a nasal prefix], *oñkrotstse**, while *u*-umlaut is found in A *oñkriṃ*, B *oñkorñō* / *oñkarñō*, *onuwaññe*, *oššale*.

§20.2.2. The question of the loss or retention of the prefixal nasal is more intricate. The general rule is that the nasal (of **æn-* as well as **yän-*) is lost. There are three main exceptions to this. The first applies to both languages: (a) the nasal is retained before a vowel. The remaining two apply to West Tocharian only: (b) the nasal is almost always retained after a rounded vocalism; (c) the nasal is sometimes lost and sometimes retained before *p* and *k*. All forms are listed here:

1. The nasal is retained before a vowel in both languages: B *anaikätte*, *anaišai*, *anaiwaitstse**, *anāsk-*, *anāyätte*, *enersänk*, *ynāñm*, *ynes*, A *ānewāts**, *āneñci* (*āneṃši*), *ynālek*.

2. Before a consonant the nasal is lost in East Tocharian without regard to preceding or following sounds; thus A *akälyme*, *akritär*, *apälkāt*, *apärkär*, *asinät*, *atāñkāt* / *atāñkac*, *aśāwe*, *āknats*, *oklop*, *omäskem*, [omäl], *opäntäš*, *opärkā*, *ošeñi*, *ykoṃ*, *ylañkam*, *ype*, *ysalu*, *yusār*, *ywic* / *ypic*. The only exceptions are *oñkalām* [not really a prefixed formation], *oñkrac*, *oñkriṃ*, contrasting with *oklop*. Retention of nasal in the sequence *oñkr-* ? A *onmīm* is formationally unclear.

3. After a non-rounded vowel the nasal is lost before a following consonant (exempting *p* and *k*, the examples of which see below) in West Tocharian. Thus

before c: *eñcare* [haplology]

before l: *alaitatte**, *alālätte*, *elauke*

before m: *amāllatte*, *amāntatte*, *amāskai*, *amaukatte**,
[*emalle**,]

before n: *anākätte*, *anautatte*, *enerke*, *enestai*, *ynaṣak* /
ynaṣkak

before ñ: *eñatketstse**, *eñw(et)sts(e)*, *yñaktem*

before r: *eraitwe*

before ś: *aśāwe*, *eśatkai*, *yśāmna* / *iśāmna*

before š: *aškār*, *eše*, *ešemāna*, *ešpirtatte*

before s: *aspāwatte**, *aswāre*, *ysamo*, *ysape* / *isape**, *ysapar*
/ *isapar*, *ysomo*

before t: *atākatte*, *atraikatte**, *etañkätte*, *etrenkätte*,
*etrīwaitstse**

before ts: *etsarkle*, *etsuwai*

before w: *aulāre*, *aurtse*, *auspa*, *awāskatte*, *awlāwatte*,
eweta, [*yästār** / *istar* ?], *ywār** / *ywārc* / *ywārcka* /
ywārška, *yweru* / *iweru*

before w': *aikatte*, *aikne*, *aitkatte*, *ite* / *īte*

before y: *aiksnar*, *airpā/itte*, *airšaitstse**, *aiskacu(?)*,
*ayātatte**

4. If the prefixal vocalism is rounded, the nasal is generally retained in West Tocharian: *ompakwättñe*, *ompalsko* / *ompalskoññe*, *ompostām*, *omprotärtstse**, *onkipše*, *onkolmo* [not really prefixed], *onkor*, *onkorñō* / *onkarñō*, *onkrotstse**, *onmiṃ* [unclear], *ontsoytte*,

oppīlom / *oppilom̐tstse** [if *-pp-* < *-mp-*]. The exceptions *ośonai* [< *-śc-*] and *oşsale* seem to indicate that the dental nasal was lost before a sequence of two consonants (*ontsoytte* has a non-organic *-t-*), and *omotruññaişşe*, *onuwaññe*, indicate a loss of the nasal before another nasal (*onmim̐* is formationally and etymologically opaque), while *orkāntai* has an *o-* that must have arisen through some kind of contraction as proven by the initial accent of this word.

5. Before *k* and *p* (and after a non-rounded vocalism) the nasal is either lost or retained in West Tocharian. It is lost if the accent of the underlying basic word from which the prefixed derivative is derived was on the first syllable, i.e. on the syllable that immediately followed the prefix when that was added. B *yapoy* is no exception for here we have a disyllabic form with regular accent retraction. Thus,

a. loss of nasal:

<i>akākatte</i>	to <i>kākā-</i>
<i>akautatte</i> *	to <i>kāutā-</i>
<i>aknātsa</i>	to <i>*knātsā</i>
<i>akraupatte</i>	to <i>krāupā-</i>
<i>apākārtse</i>	to <i>pākār*</i>
<i>apākre</i> / <i>apākri</i>	to <i>pākār*</i>
<i>apāşşätte</i>	to <i>*pāşşā-</i> (later <i>pāşşā-</i>)
<i>aplāc</i>	to <i>plācā</i>
<i>ekamätte</i>	to <i>kāmā-*</i>
<i>ekalätte</i> *	to <i>kālā-</i>
<i>ekalymi</i>	to <i>kālymi</i>
<i>ekatkatte</i> *	to <i>kātkā-</i>
<i>ekwalatte</i> *	to <i>kwālā-*</i>
<i>epinkte</i>	to <i>pínkte</i>

<i>ePLYUwai</i>	to * <i>PLYúwai</i>
<i>eprete</i>	to * <i>préte</i>
<i>yapoy</i>	to * <i>pwáy</i> [or possibly * <i>púwāy</i> ?]
<i>yparwe</i>	to <i>párwe</i>

b. retention of nasal:

<i>amplākátte</i>	to <i>plāká-</i>
<i>añkaiṃ</i>	to * <i>kāwá-yn-</i> ?
<i>añklautkatte*</i>	to <i>klāutká-</i>
<i>empakwátte*</i>	to <i>pākwá-</i>
<i>empalkatte*</i>	to <i>pālká-</i>
<i>emparkre</i>	to <i>pārkāre</i>
<i>empelle</i>	to * <i>pelíye</i>
[<i>empreṃ</i>	loanword?]
<i>emprukšai</i>	to <i>prukšíyai</i> [to pres. VIII <i>prukšá-</i>]
<i>eñkalpatte*</i>	to <i>kālpá-*</i>
<i>eñkarstatte*</i>	to <i>kārstá-*</i>
<i>eñkatkre*</i>	to <i>kātkāre</i>
<i>eñkaucar</i>	to <i>keucārā*</i>
<i>eñklyaušátte</i>	to <i>klyeušá-</i>
<i>yñkaum, iñkaum</i>	to * <i>kāyé-wn-</i>

There is an indication that East Tocharian may have known the same kind of dichotomy as seen in B *epínkte* vs. *emparkre*. Thus we find umlaut in A *opántāš* (B *epínkte*), *opásši* (B *epastye*), *opšāly* (B *ekšalye*), *opyāc* (B *epiyac*), and *opārkā* (B no match), whose West Tocharian correspondences, when found, do not exhibit a nasal in the prefix, whereas there is lack of umlaut in A *apārkār* (B *emparkre*), *apālkāt* (B *empalkatte**) whose West Tocharian correspondences do exhibit a retained prefixal nasal. This seems to indicate that East Tocharian

rounding occurred only if – at the time of the rounding – there was no intervening nasal between the vowel to be rounded and the rounding factor (*p*).

§20.3. Finally, one might ask, whether the conditions here proposed for the loss or retention of the nasals can be seen as phonetically likely. It would seem easiest to assume that the prefixal nasals were not actually consonantal at the crucial time, but that they were a feature of the preceding vowels, i.e. nasalizations. Formations with the local prefix might be taken as the point of departure, if these are correctly judged as original locutions of prepositions + nouns. If the merger of preposition + noun took place in Tocharian at a time when final nasals were still retained as nasalizations, the resulting new compounds would have had nasalized vowels in initial position. Since the local **H_lŋ-* and the negating **ŋ-* merged phonologically in Tocharian, the nasalization feature of the local preposition → prefix spread analogically to the negating prefix, so that all nasal prefixes had the feature nasalization, whereas forms with radical nasals retained their consonantal nasals (cf. e.g. B *erikwe* ‘man’ as against *ekaly_{mi}* ‘in the power of’).

If the prefixed formations at the time in question had a nasalized prefixal vocalism and not a consonantal nasal (setting them apart from non-prefixed formations), subsequent development, as witnessed in the actual forms, is not particularly surprising. The retention of the nasal before vowels could be ascribed to sandhi: in this position the nasal of the preposition had remained consonantal. Before consonants the nasalization was usually lost, which needs no specific reason, except after a rounded vocalism when it was (almost) always retained, and before *p* and *k* when it was either retained or lost. First, the (almost unconditional) retention of the nasal after a rounded vocalism

harmonizes with an observable tendency in other languages. Thus, e.g. in Polish final *-ą* [-ɔ̃] still retains its nasalization, while final *-ę* has lost it, being pronounced [-e]. A similar phenomenon is observable in Old Icelandic where there are indices that nasalized *ɔ* survived longer than other nasalized vowels. Second, the specific development before *p* and *k*, in contradistinction to the development before *t*, might be seen in connection with the labialization and the velarization of the nasal vowel before *p* and *k* respectively. These features may have rendered the nasalized vowels more resistant to denasalization. Their survival or loss ultimately came to depend on the position of the accent. If immediately followed by an accented vowel, the prefixal vowel was denasalized, but retained its nasal feature, and even developed it into a full-fledged nasal consonant, if the accent was further removed. These phenomena could be seen in connection with the tendency, observable in many languages, to reduce the power of articulation in the syllable immediately preceding the accented syllable. In Tocharian this seems to have had the effect that a nasalized vowel lost its nasalization. If the accent does not immediately follow, the syllable in question is not liable to suffer reduction to the same degree, and this, apparently, was sufficient to ensure the survival of the nasalization in the relevant instances in Tocharian. This description applies to West Tocharian. In East Tocharian, of course, the development went on unto its consequent limits, i.e. the denasalization of all nasalized vowels.

§20.4. A final comment might be made concerning the accentuation of such privatives as B *enklyáuṣätte* or *enkálpatte** vis-à-vis their *formes de fondation*, B *klyauṣá-* and *kálpá-* resp., or such words with the local prefix as B *empárkre* or *enkátkre* vis-à-vis their basis-forms, B *párkáre* and *kátkáre* resp. Clearly, in these prefixed formations

the accent has been retracted to the second syllable from its original seat on the third syllable, i.e., e.g., from B *pärkäre* was derived the prefixed **empärkäre* whose accent was retracted to yield **empärkäre* > *emparkre*. This retraction must be seen as due to the influence of the regular accentual pattern of West Tocharian (possibly of Common Tocharian) that demanded the accentuation of the second syllable of polysyllabic forms. We observe this kind of retraction in all prefixed forms in the widest sense: thus, in those reduplicated past participles that originally had accent on the suffixal vocalism, it has been retracted to the root syllable (i.e. second syllable of the word form). The original accentuation of such reduplicated past participles can be inferred in more than one ways, e.g. by the *ā*-umlaut of the reduplication syllable in East Tocharian, indicating an *ā*-vocalism in the radical syllable, which in turn would not have been umlauted itself if it had not been unaccented. The consequent initial accent of East Tocharian is a late phenomenon.

Indices

The alphabetical order is that of the Latin alphabet, so that, e.g., s s s are all simply classed as s. The references are to paragraphs (§) and footnotes (n).

East Tocharian

- āk §17.1.14.2;
- akälyme §3; §18.1.4; §18.1.10; §20.2.2;
- ākär §17.1.7 n84;
- ākiñc §17.1.14.2;
- ākl- §11.4;
- āknats §3; §16.2.1; §17.1.2; §20.2.2;
- akritär §18.1.5; §20.2.2;
- ālak §19.7;
- āle §17.1.12;
- āmpi, āmpuk §17.1.2;
- āñcām §19.8;
- āneñci, āneñsi §16.1.5; §20.2.2;
- ānewats* §3; §16.2.2; §17.1.2; §20.2.2;
- añsär, amśär §18.2.1; §18.2.4;
- ānt §16.1.5;
- añu, āñu §18.1.6; §18.1.20;
- apälkät §9.1.3; §9.1.3.1; §17.1.10; §20.2.2;
- apärkär §3; §9.1.3.1; §17.1.10; §18.1.7; §18.1.13; §20.2.2;
- āsāwe §16.1.9; §20.2.2;
- asinät §7.2.9 n30; §11.2.1; §17.4.6; §20.2.2;
- atāñkac §12.3.1; §20.2.2;
- atāñkät §12.3.1; §20.2.2;
- empele §18.2.2;
- eñcare §18.2.4;
- eśe §16.1.3;
- kälp- §9.2.2;
- kälyme §3; §17.1.8; §18.1.5; §18.1.10;
- kam §17.4.1;
- kem §16.1.6;
- kip §17.2.1;
- klin- §7.2.9 n30;
- klop §3; §17.1.1;
- knä- §3; §16.2.1 and n76;
- koc §18.1.19;
- kom §3; §16.1.6; §19.6;
- kompärkant §17.1.14.2;
- komtpant §17.1.14.2;
- komwmant §17.1.14.2;
- kot- §7.1.2 n8;
- krop- §7.1.3 n9;
- kror §17.1.7;
- kul- §9.1.2;
- läñk- §19.4;
- let-, lit- §7.2.1;
- lok §18.1.11;
- lotk- §7.1.4.2; §7.2.8;
- lutk- §7.1.4.2; §7.2.8;
- mäcricp §17.1.3;
- māk §17.4.2;
- mäl- §7.2.2;
- mänt- §7.2.3; §7.2.8;
- märs- §9.1.2;
- mäsk- §7.2.5; §16.1.4; §17.1.2;
- mäski §16.1.2; §16.1.7; §17.1.2;
- mi- §17.4.3;
- motarci §17.1.3;
- muk- §7.2.4;
- näkäm §17.1.11;
- nas- §7.2.7; §18.1.17;
- ñom §17.4.1;
- nu- §17.1.2;
- ñu §18.1.20;
- nut- §7.2.5; §16.2.2;
- nwām §7.2.5;
- nuwem §17.1.2;
- oklop §3; §17.1.1; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
- olar §16.1.11;
- omäl §17.4.1; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
- omäskem §17.1.2; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
- omälsune* §17.4.1;
- omlyi §17.4.1;
- oñk §17.2.2.1;
- oñkaläp §17.4.2; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;

- oñkrac §17.2.2; §17.2.2.1; §20.2.1;
 §20.2.2;
 oñkraci §17.2.2.1;
 oñkrim §17.1.3; §17.1.8.1; §20.2.1;
 §20.2.2;
 onmim §17.4.3; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 onmīši §17.4.3;
 opāntāš §3; §9.1.3.1; §17.1.9;
 §17.1.10; §18.1.12; §18.1.21;
 §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 opārkā §17.1.10; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 opāšši §17.1.10; §17.4.4; §20.2.1;
 opāššune §17.4.4;
 opšāly §17.1.10; §17.4.5; §20.2.1;
 opyāc §17.1.10; §20.2.1;
 ošeñi §3; §17.1.14.3; §17.1.14.4;
 §20.2.2;
 osit §17.4.6;
 pākār §16.1.7;
 pākraši §16.1.7;
 pālsk- §17.1.2;
 pānt §3; §17.1.9;
 pārk- §17.1.10;
 pārkār §18.1.12;
 pāštāk (imp.) §7.2.7;
 plāc §16.1.8;
 plāk- §11.5;
 plyaskem §17.1.2;
 pracar §17.2.2.1;
 pratim §18.1.23;
 pratsak §17.1.2;
 retwe §18.1.24;
 ritw- §18.1.24;
 rtār §18.1.5;
 šāk §16.2.3; §17.1.14.3; §16.2.3;
 salu §19.12;
 šanwem §17.4.2; §18.1.2.2;
 šar §16.2.3; §18.1.27;
 sātk- §16.2.3;
 sāwe §16.1.9;
 sin- §7.2.9 n30; §11.2.1;
 škārā §16.1.2; §16.1.7; §16.1.10;
 §17.1.14.2; §18.1.2.2; §18.1.9;
 slākkār §8.4.4 n56;
 šñi §16.2.3;
 šom §18.1.26;
 špām §16.2.3; §17.1.14.3;
 spartu §4.3;
 spārtw- §4.3; §7.2.7 n19;
 sruk- §7.2.5; §9.1.2;
 šu-, šwā- §9.2.2;
 šul §17.1.14; §17.1.14.2; §17.1.14.3;
 §17.1.14.4;
 šuliñc §17.1.14; §17.1.14.2;
 swā- §16.2.3;
 swāñcem §16.2.3; §17.1.2;
 swār §16.2.3; §18.1.5;
 tākā- §7.2.7;
 tāñk- §12.3.1;
 tkam §19.6;
 tpār §18.1.5;
 trask- * §13.2.2;
 trik- §8.4.3 n55;
 tsopats §16.1.9;
 tsu- §18.1.30;
 wāl- §7.2.9;
 wāl §7.2.9;
 wālts §7.2.9;
 wārkānt §17.1.12; §17.4.2; §18.1.2.2;
 wārts §18.1.8;
 wāsk- §7.2.8;
 wāšpā §18.1.9;
 wāst §19.3;
 wiki §19.1;
 wlāw- §7.2.9;
 wram §17.4.1;
 wše §3; §17.1.14.4;
 yāks- §18.1.2.2;
 yāt- §8.4.4;
 ykom §3; §17.1.14.4; §19.6; §20.2.2;
 ylañkam §1.1; §19.4; §20.1; §20.2.2;
 ynālek §1.1; §19.2; §19.7; §20.1;
 §20.2.2;
 ynāñm §3; §19.8;
 ynāñmune §19.8;
 yneš §3; §19.10;
 yok- §17.1.14.3;
 ype §1.1; §3; §19.2; §20.1; §20.2.2;
 ysalu §19.12; §20.2.2;
 ysamo §19.13; §19.15;

ysomo §19.15;
 yu- §7.2.5; §16.2.2;
 yuk §17.1.14.3;
 yulā §16.2.2;
 yulāsum §16.2.2;
 yusār §19.17; §20.2.2;
 ywārckā, ywārskā §19.18;
 ywic, ypic §19.1; §20.2.2;

West Tocharian

ai- §10; §11.1; §11.4; §11.5; §13.2.3;
 aik- §10; §12.5; §16.1.3;
 aikatte* §4.4; §8; §8.3; §8.4.1;
 §8.4.5; §9.2.2; §20.2.2;
 aikne §18.1.1; §18.1.2.3; §18.1.3;
 §20.2.2;
 aiksnar §18.1.2; §18.1.2.1; §18.1.2.2;
 §18.1.2.3; §20.2.2;
 airpā/itte §3; §10 n64; §12; §12.7;
 §13; §20.2.2;
 airšaitstse* §18.1.3; §20.2.2;
 aišai §16.1.3;
 aiskacu §14; §20.2.2;
 aittatte* §8; §8.3; §8.4.2 and n50;
 §8.4.5; §9.2.2; §17.1.12; §20.2.2;
 aiw- §3; §7.2.5; §16.2.2;
 akākatte §4.4; §7; §7.1; §7.1.1;
 §7.1.4; §20.2.2;
 akart(t)e §16.1.1; §17.1.12 n88;
 akautatte* §4.4; §7; §7.1; §7.1.2;
 §7.1.4; §20.2.2;
 ākl- §11.4 and n68;
 aknātsa §3; §16.2.1; §16.2.2 n78;
 §17.1.2; §19.2; §20.2.2;
 akraupatte §7; §7.1; §7.1.3; §7.1.4;
 §20.2.2;
 akrūna §17.1.7 n84;
 āl- §11.4; §11.5;
 alaitatte* §7; §7.2.1; §20.2.2;
 alālātte §11; §11.4; §20.2.2;
 ālāsk- §13.2.1;
 aletstse §19.7;
 allek, alyek §19.7;
 alyiye* §17.1.12;
 amāllatte §7; §7.2.2; §20.2.2;

amāntatte §7; §7.2.3; §7.2.8; §20.2.2;
 amāskai §16.1.2; §16.1.7; §17.1.2;
 §18.1.17; §20.2.2;
 amaukatte* §7; §7.2.4; §20.2.2;
 amplākātte §11; §11.5; §20.2.2;
 anaikātte* §12; §12.5; §20.2.2;
 anaiktai §12.5;
 anaišai §16.1.3; §18.1.17; §20.2.2;
 anaiwaitstse* §3; §16.2.2 and n77;
 §17.1.2; §20.2.2;
 anākātte §4.4; §12; §12.1; §20.2.2;
 ānāsk- §1.3; §9.2.2; §13.2.1; §16.1.4;
 §16.2.3; §20.1; §20.2.2;
 anautatte* §7; §7.2.5; §20.2.2;
 anāyātte §11; §11.1; §20.2.2;
 ankaim §16.1.6; §20.2.2;
 anklauskatte* §7; §7.1; §7.1.4;
 §7.1.4.2; §11.5; §20.2.2;
 ānme §3; §19.8;
 ānte §16.1.5;
 ānu §18.1.20;
 apākārtse §16.1.7; §17.1.14.1;
 §20.2.2;
 apākre* §16.1.7; §17.1.14.1; §20.2.2;
 apākri §16.1.7; §20.2.2;
 apāššātte §13; §13.2; §13.2.3;
 §20.2.2;
 aplāc §16.1.8; §20.2.2;
 ārsk- §13.2.2;
 artsaywarcameñ §19.18;
 ārtt- §7.1.4.1;
 ās- §8.1.2; §8.1.3 and n40; §11.5;
 ašāwe §16.1.9; §20.2.2;
 aškār §16.1.2; §16.1.7; §16.1.10;
 §18.1.2.2; §18.1.9; §20.2.2;
 aspāwatte* §7; §7.2.6; §20.2.2;
 aswāre §16.1.4; §16.2.3; §20.2.2;
 atākatte §7; §7.2.7; §20.2.2;
 atraikatte* §8; §8.1; §8.4.3 and n54;
 §9.2.2; §20.2.2;
 aul- §10;
 aulāre §16.1.11; §20.2.2;
 aun- §10; §12;
 aurtse §18.1.8; §20.2.2;
 auspa §18.1.9; §20.2.2;

- awāskatte* §7; §7.2.8; §20.2.2;
 awlāwatte* §7; §7.2.9; §20.2.2;
 ayāmātte* §11.6;
 ayātatte* §7; §7.2.10; §8; §8.1; §8.4.4
 and n58; §9.2.2; §18.1.31;
 §20.2.2;
 cāñcare, cāñcare §18.1.4;
 cowai §18.1.30;
 ek, eś §1.1; §3; §19.10;
 ekalātte* §12; §12.2; §20.2.2;
 ekalyai §3; §18.1.4; §18.1.10;
 §20.2.2; §20.3;
 ekamātte §12; §12.6; §20.2.2;
 ekatkatte* §5.1; §9; §9.1.1; §19.2;
 §20.2.2;
 ekšalye §17.1.10; §17.4.5; §20.2.2;
 ekwalatte* §9; §9.1.2; §20.2.2;
 elauke §18.1.11; §20.2.2;
 emalle §17.4.1; §20.2.2;
 emalya §17.4.1;
 empakwātte §11; §11.3; §11.5;
 §20.2.2;
 empalkatte* §8.4.4; §9; §9.1.3;
 §9.1.3.1; §9.2.2; §17.1.10;
 §20.2.2;
 emparkre §3; §9.1.3.1; §11.3;
 §17.1.10; §18.1.7; §18.1.12;
 §18.1.20; §18.1.26 n98; §20.2.2;
 §20.4;
 empelle §18.2.2; §19.2; §20.2.2;
 empreṃ §18.1.13; §20.2.2;
 emprukṣai §18.1.14; §18.1.17;
 §20.2.2;
 enāsk- §13.2.1;
 eñatketstse* §18.2.3; §20.2.2;
 eñcare §18.2.1; §18.2.4; §20.2.2;
 enepre §18.1.17;
 enerke §18.1.15; §20.2.2;
 enersānk §18.2.5; §20.2.2;
 (e)neṣamyai §18.1.16;
 enestai §18.1.17; §20.2.2;
 eñk- §10; §11.4; §13.2.1;
 eñkalpatte* §4.4; §8.4.4; §9.2; §9.2.2;
 §20.2.2; §20.4;
 eñkarstatte* §9; §9.1.4; §19.2;
 §20.2.2;
 eñkātkre §1.1; §18.1.18; §20.2.2;
 §20.4;
 eñkaucar §18.1.19; §20.2.2;
 eñklyausātte §12.5; §13; §13.1;
 §17.1.8; §20.2.2; §20.4;
 eñkwe §17.1.8; §20.3;
 eñwetstse* §18.1.6; §18.1.20;
 §20.2.2;
 epastye §17.1.10; §17.4.4; §20.2.2;
 epinkte §3; §9.1.3.1; §17.1.9 and n85;
 §17.1.10; §18.1.12; §18.1.21;
 §20.2.2;
 ep(i)yac §17.1.10; §20.2.2;
 eplyuwai §18.1.17; §18.1.22; §20.2.2;
 eprete §18.1.23; §20.2.2;
 epretñe §18.1.23;
 er- §10;
 eraitwe §1.1; §18.1.24; §20.2.2;
 ersānk §18.2.5;
 eśatkai §18.1.17; §18.1.25; §20.2.2;
 eṣe §18.1.26; §20.1; §20.2.2;
 eṣerñāna §18.1.27; §20.2.2;
 eṣpirtatte §4.4; §8; §8.4.5; §9.2.2;
 §20.2.2;
 eśuwatte* §9.2; §9.2.1;
 etañkātte §12; §12.3; §20.2.2;
 etrenkātte §12; §12.4; §20.2.2;
 etrīwaitstse* §18.1.28; §20.2.2;
 etsarkle §18.1.29; §20.2.2;
 etsuwai §18.1.17; §18.1.30; §20.2.2;
 eweta §18.1.31; §20.2.2;
 ewetaicci* §18.1.31;
 ikāṃ §19.1;
 ispek §19.14;
 ite, īte §18.1.23; §19.1; §20.2.2;
 kāk- §4.4; §7.1.1; §7.1.4;
 kāl- §8.1.3; §10; §12.2; §12.6;
 kālm- §11.4; §11.5;
 kālṣ- §4.4; §8.4.4; §9.2.2; §20.4;
 kālśk- §17.1.14;
 kālymiye §3; §17.1.8; §17.1.12 n87;
 §18.1.5; §18.1.10;
 kām- §12.6; §18.1.2.2;

- kārst- §9; §9.1.4; §16.2.2;
 kārstautse* §16.2.2;
 käsk- §13.2.2;
 kästwer §18.1.2;
 kät- §5.1; §7.1.4.2; §7.2.8; §8.1.3;
 §9; §9.1.1; §9.1.4; §18.1.25;
 kät-kare §1.1; §18.1.18; §20.4;
 kät-käššar (imp.) §8.1.3;
 kau- §7.1.3 n9; §10;
 kauc §18.1.19;
 kaup §1.1; §3; §16.1.6; §19.6;
 kaut- §7.1.2 and n8; §7.1.4; §16.2.2;
 kautalñe §4.4;
 kautātse* §16.2.2;
 kem §19.6;
 keru §19.19;
 klautk- §7.1; §7.1.4; §7.1.4.1;
 §7.1.4.2; §7.2.1; §7.2.8; §11.5;
 klutk- §7.1.4.2; §7.2.8; §13.2.3;
 klyaus- §8.1.2; §12.5; §13; §13.1;
 §20.4;
 kl(y)in- §7.2.9 n30;
 knā- §16.2.1;
 kokale §17.1.14.3;
 kom-klāskomem §17.1.14;
 §17.1.14.1;
 kom-pirkomem §17.1.14;
 kotruññe §17.1.3;
 kottār §17.1.3;
 kraup- §7.1.3; §7.1.4; §7.1.3 n9;
 krör- §17.1.7;
 ku- §10;
 kul- §9.1.2;
 kwā- §7.1.1;
 kwāl- §9; §9.1.2;
 kwār- §17.2.2;
 kwele §9.1.2;
 kwipe §17.2.1;
 lait- §7.2.1;
 läk- §9.1.2; §9.2.1; §16.2.2;
 laūtse §16.2.2;
 lāl- §11.1; §11.4 and n68; §11.5;
 lāmās (imp.) §8.1.3 n39;
 lāms §7.2.5;
 lāms- §7.2.5;
 läre §16.1.11;
 lauke §18.1.11;
 lenke §19.4;
 leswi §17.1.14.3;
 luk- §11.5; §12.5;
 lukšaitse §16.2.2;
 lup- §11.5;
 lut- §11.4;
 lyyā- §11.4;
 māka §17.4.2;
 māl- §7.2.2;
 mänk- §9.1.2;
 mänt- §7.2.3; §7.2.8;
 märs- §9.1.2;
 mäsk- §7.2.5; §8.1.3; §10; §16.1.4;
 §17.1.2;
 maskäššar (imp.) §8.1.3;
 māskw §16.1.2 and n74;
 mauk- §7.2.4;
 mi- §17.4.3;
 mit §17.1.11;
 mit- §9.1.2;
 miw- §10;
 mlaše §11.5;
 mlut- §9.2.2;
 motārts(ts)e* §17.1.3;
 nāk- §4.4; §10; §12.1;
 nāki §17.1.11;
 ñakte §19.5;
 nān- §11.4;
 nār- §18.1.15; §18.2.5;
 ñās, ñyās §13.2.3;
 nāsk- §13.2.2;
 ñāsk- §13.2.2; §13.2.3;
 nätk- §7.1.4.2; §18.2.3;
 naunto* §19.6 n103;
 nauš §19.9;
 naut- §7.2.5; §16.2.2;
 nerke §18.1.15;
 nes- §7.2.7; §10; §18.1.17;
 nesk- §13.2.2;
 ñor §17.1.7;
 nuttse (nauttse) §7.2.5 and n14;
 §16.2.2;
 ñuwe §18.1.20;

- ñwetstse §18.1.20;
 oktakar §18.1.2.2;
 omotruññaişse §3 n3; §17.1.3;
 §17.1.14; §18.1.17; §20.2.1;
 §20.2.2;
 ompakwättñe §11.3; §17.1.11; §17.3;
 §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 ompalsko §17.1.4; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 ompalskoññe §11.3; §17.1.4;
 §17.1.11; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 ompolskoññe §17.1.4;
 ompostäm §17.1.4; §17.1.5; §20.2.1;
 §20.2.2;
 omprotärtstse* §3; §11.3; §17.1.4;
 §17.1.6; §17.1.11; §20.2.1;
 §20.2.2;
 oñkarño, oñkorño §17.1.3; §17.1.8;
 §17.1.8.1; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 oñkarñiatstsa §17.1.8;
 oñkipşe §17.2.1; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 oñkolmo §17.4.2; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 oñkor §17.1.7 and n84; §17.1.8;
 §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 oñkorño, see oñkarño
 oñkrotstse* §17.2.2; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 onmim §17.4.3; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 onmimşşe §17.4.3;
 onmissu* §17.4.3;
 onolme §17.4.2;
 onsoyotte §11; §11.1; §11.2; §11.2.1;
 §17.1.13; §17.3; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 onuwaññe §3 n3; §7.2.5; §9.2.1;
 §17.2.3; §20.2.1; §20.2.2;
 oppilo/äm, oppilomstse* §3 n3;
 §11.3; §17.1.11 and n86; §20.2.1;
 §20.2.2;
 orkantai §3 n3; §17 n82; §17.1.12;
 §17.1.13; §18.1.17; §20.2.2;
 orotstse §17.2.2;
 oşonai §3 n3; §17.n82; §17.1.13;
 §17.1.14.4; §18.1.17; §20.2.1;
 §20.2.2;
 oş(ş)a)le §3 n3; §16.1.7; §17.1.3;
 §17.1.13; §17.1.14 and n89;
 §17.1.14.1; §17.1.14.2; (cont.)
 §17.1.14.3; §17.1.14.4; §20.2.1;
 §20.2.2;
 päccapa (imp.) §8.1.3;
 päklyauş (imp.) §8.1.2;
 päkre §16.1.7; §17.1.14.1;
 päkri §16.1.7; §17.1.14.1;
 päkw- §10; §11.3; §11.5;
 päl- §7.2.2;
 palı* §17.1.11;
 pälk- ('see') §8.4.4; §9; §9.1.3;
 §9.1.4; §11.5; §12.5;
 pälk- ('burn') §9.1.3;
 palsko §17.1.4;
 pärkare §3; §18.1.12; §18.1.20;
 §18.1.26 n98; §20.4;
 pärsäntse §16.2.2;
 pärsk- §18.1.3;
 parwe §3; §16.1.4; §19.11;
 päsa, pasāt (imp.) §8.1.2; §8.1.3 and
 n40;
 päscama (imp.) §8.1.3;
 päsk- §12.5; §13; §13.2; §13.2.2;
 §13.2.3;
 pässakw §17.1.11 and n86;
 päşşat (imp.) §8.1.2;
 pätriwa-ne (imp.) §8.1.2 n36; §8.1.3;
 pätsilpar-ñ (imp.) §8.1.2; §8.1.3 n45);
 pättäsāt (imp.) §8.1.2; §8.1.3;
 paucim §17.4.3;
 pele §18.2.2;
 peşpirttu §4.4; §7.2.7 n19; §8.4.5;
 pika (imp.) §8.1.3; §8.3; §8.4.1;
 pinkte §3; §17.1.9; §18.1.21;
 pırat (imp.) §8.1.3;
 -pırko §17.1.10;
 piş §12.7;
 pişakar §18.1.2.2;
 pıta (imp.) §8.1.3;
 pitka (imp.) §8.1.3; §8.2; §8.3;
 pkāla, pkalar (imp.) §8.1.3;
 plāce §16.1.8;
 plāk- §11.5; §12.5;
 plāma, plamas-ñ (imp.) §8.1.3 and
 n39;
 plātık- §10;

- plu- §10; §18.1.22;
 postām §17.1.5;
 prānk- §17.1.11;
 pratīm §18.1.23;
 pratsāko §17.1.2;
 prek- §10; §16.2.2;
 prekṣātstse §16.2.2;
 preściyo §18.1.14;
 procer §3; §17.2.2.1;
 proskaitstse* §18.1.3;
 prosko, proskiye §18.1.3;
 pruk- §18.1.14;
 prutk- §18.1.2.2;
 prutkar (imp.) §8.1.2 n36; §8.1.3;
 psaina (imp.) §8.1.2; §8.1.3;
 psaiso (imp.) §8.1.2 n34;
 pśāya*, pśāyā* (imp.) §8.1.2 n38;
 putk- §17.4.3;
 pwāyar-me (imp.) §8.1.3;
 raitwe §1.1; §18.1.24;
 rāk- §11.5; §12.5;
 rānk- §11.5; §12.5;
 ratre §18.1.5;
 re- §11.4;
 rin- §16.2.2;
 rinaccu §16.2.2;
 ritt- §18.1.24;
 śai- §8.1.2;
 sain- §8.1.3; §10;
 śālāt (imp.?) §8.1.3;
 sāle §17.1.12;
 šale §17.1.14; §17.1.14.2; §17.1.14.3;
 §17.1.14.4;
 sālk- §7.1.4.2;
 sālp- §10;
 sāmp- §11.4; §11.5;
 sāmp- §7.2.5; §16.2.2;
 sāmpa §16.2.2;
 śāmpāsse §7.2.5; §16.2.2;
 šaṇ §16.2.3;
 sana (nom.sg.fem.) §19.15;
 sape, spe §19.14;
 šārp- §12.7;
 sātāsk- §13.2.1; §16.1.4; §16.2.3;
 sātk- §16.2.3;
 šaitkai §18.1.25;
 šaumo §3; §19.2; §19.16;
 ścirye §17.1.12 n87;
 ścono §17.1.13;
 še §18.1.26;
 sekwe §17.1.14.3;
 seme §18.1.26;
 šer §16.2.3; §18.1.27;
 šertwe §17.1.14.3;
 šerwe §17.1.14.3;
 šesa §18.1.26;
 sik- §16.1.10;
 šiko §16.1.10;
 sin- §10;
 škaš §16.2.3;
 sklok- §11.5;
 slak(k)are §8.4.4 n56;
 šmare §17.1.14.3;
 šñor §17.1.7;
 somo (obl.sg.fem.) §19.15;
 soy §19.2;
 soy- §10; §11.1; §11.2;
 spālk- §11.4;
 špane §16.2.3;
 spānt- §7.2.7 n19;
 spārtt- §4.3; §7.1.4.1; §7.2.7 n19; §8;
 §8.4.5;
 spāw- §7.2.6;
 spertte §4.3; §17.1.14.3;
 sruk- §7.2.5; §9.1.2;
 stām- §7.2.7 n19; §8.1.3;
 staukk- §7.2.7 n19;
 šu-, šwā- §9.2.1; §9.2.2;
 suwo §16.2.3;
 swā- §16.2.3;
 swāñco, swāñciye §16.2.3; §17.1.2;
 swāññe §16.2.3;
 swāre §16.2.3; §18.1.5;
 syā- §16.2.3;
 tā-, tās- §12.5 n70;
 tākā- §7.2.7;
 tām- §13.2.1;
 tānk- §12.3;
 tāp- §8.1.3 and n43;
 tapre §18.1.5;

- tärk- §17.1.11;
 tek- §10; §12.3;
 tin- §11.4;
 traike §8.4.3;
 traiwo §18.1.28;
 tränk- §10;
 trenk- §10; §11.4; §12.5;
 tresk- §13.2.2;
 trik- §8; §8.4.3 and n55; §11.5;
 §12.5;
 triw- §18.1.28;
 trīwaitse* §16.2.2;
 tsāk- §16.2.2;
 tsakātse* §16.2.2;
 tsälp- §8.1.2;
 tsäm- §9.1.2; §11.5;
 tsänk- ('arise') §7.2.6; §9.1.2;
 tsänk- ('flay') §11.5; §12.5;
 tsärk- §12.5; §18.1.29;
 tsu- §18.1.30;
 tsuk- §8.4.4;
 tsuwai §18.1.30;
 waipṭāyar §18.1.2.2;
 wāki §17.1.11;
 wäks- §7.2.8 and n24;
 wāl- §7.2.9;
 walo §7.2.9;
 wālts- §7.2.9;
 wāp- §16.2.1;
 wapāttsa §16.2.1; §16.2.2 n78;
 wär- §8.1.3;
 wärp- §12.7;
 wärsk- §10; §11.5; §13.2.2; §13.2.3;
 warts(ts)e §18.1.8;
 wäs- ('dress') §10; §11.4; §11.5;
 wäs- ('stay') §11.4; §11.5; §17.1.14.3;
 wäsk-, wäsk- §7.2.8; §13.2.2;
 wasto §19.3;
 wät-, wet- §18.1.31;
 wätk- §8; §8.1.3; §8.4.1; §8.4.5;
 §9.2.2; §10;
 we- §11.4; §13.2.3;
 weru §19.19;
 weta §18.1.31;
 wik- §4.4; §8; §8.1.3; §8.4.1; §8.4.5;
 wināsk- §13.2.1; §13.2.3;
 wlāw- §7.2.9;
 yakne §18.1.1;
 yäks- §18.1.2; §18.1.2.1; §18.1.2.2;
 yaltse §7.2.9;
 yām- §10; §11.4; §11.5; §11.6;
 §16.2.2;
 *yāmätte §16.2.2;
 yapoy §1.1; §3; §19.2 and n102;
 §20.1; §20.2.2;
 yärp- §3; §10 and n64; §12.7;
 yärs- §18.1.3;
 yäršiyē §18.1.3;
 yäsk- §11.4; §11.5; §13.2.2;
 yästär*, istär §19.3;
 yāt- §8; §8.4.4;
 yät- §8.1.3;
 yaukk- §10; §11.4; §11.5;
 yeksnar §18.1.2.1; §18.1.2.2;
 §18.1.2.3;
 yerkwanto* §17.1.12; §17.4.2;
 §18.1.2.2;
 yerter §18.1.2.1;
 yirpšuki §12.7 and n72;
 yñaktem, iñaktem §19.5; §20.2.2;
 ynāñm §3; §19.8; §20.2.2;
 ynāñmāññe §19.8;
 ynaušak, ynauškak §19.9; §20.2.2;
 yneš §1.1; §3; §19.10; §20.2.2;
 ynkaum, inkaum §1.1; §3; §19.6;
 §20.2.2;
 yok- §17.1.14.3;
 yop- §10;
 yparwe §3; §19.2; §19.11; §20.2.2;
 yparwetstse §19.11;
 ypoye §19.2;
 ysāmna §3; §19.2; §20.2.2;
 ysamo §19.13; §19.15; §20.2.2;
 ysāmna, isāmna §19.16;
 ysapar, isapar §19.14; §20.2.2;
 ysaparsa §19.14;
 ysape, isape §19.14; §20.2.2;
 ysomo §19.13; §19.15; §20.2.2;
 yu- §7.2.5; §16.2.2;
 yuk- §11.5;

ywār* §19.18 and n105; §20.2.2;
 ywārc §19.18; §20.2.2;
 ywarca §19.18;
 ywārcīsi §19.18;
 ywārcka, ywārska §19.18; §20.2.2;
 ywārtsa §19.18;
 ywārtaś §19.18;
 yweru, iweru §19.19; §20.2.2;

Indic

āsta- §18.1.17;
 agamat §13.2.3;
 akṣara- §17.2.2;
 ajñāta- §16.2.1;
 as- §17.1.2;
 asatya- §17.1.2;
 ātapa- §18.1.29;
 āvasati §17.4.6;
 cāraṭi §9.1.2;
 darśatā- §4.3;
 gacchati §13.2.3;
 glāyati, glāti §9.1.2;
 guṇa- (Pāli) §17.1.11 and n86;
 hānu- §17.4.2;
 mahāmṛga- §17.4.2;
 menī- §17.4.3;
 muñcāti §7.2.4;
 nīthā §19.6;
 pajrā- §16.1.7;
 pari §17.1.11 and n86;
 puṭa- §17.1.7;
 sāras- §17.1.14.3;
 stāyāt §18.1.17;
 (s)tāyū- §18.1.17;
 ūpa §19.14;
 ūṇōti §7.2.9;
 ūṇā §7.2.9;
 urū- §18.1.8;
 vēti §16.2.2;
 vṛddhā- §18.1.8;
 vṛpākti §17.1.12;
 vṛpōti §7.2.9;
 yajatā- §4.3;

Greek

ἄγα- §17.4.2;
 ἄγα-κλεῖς §17.4.2;
 Ἀγαμέμνων §17.4.2;
 ἄγνός §16.2.1;
 ἄγνωτος §16.2.1;
 ἀμφίπολος §17.4.2;
 ἄσχετος §4.3;
 ἀφθαρσία §17.2.2;
 γαιήοχος §7.2.8;
 δειδω §7.2.8;
 ἔθηκα §7.2.7;
 εἰλέω §7.2.9;
 εἰλύω §7.2.9;
 ἔλος §17.1.14.3;
 ἔλυτρον §7.2.9;
 ἔστηκα §7.2.7 and n17;
 εὐρύς §7.2.9; §18.1.8;
 ἱθύς §17.4.6;
 καίω §19.6;
 νόστος §18.1.17;
 οὐδας §19.2. n102;
 πέλμα §17.1.11;
 πέλω §9.1.2;
 πολεύω §7.1.4.2;
 σπάω §7.2.6;
 στρεύομαι §9.1.2;
 τόρμος §17.4.2;
 τρῆμα §17.4.2;
 ὑπό §19.14;
 φυκτός §4.3;
 ὠλήν §17.1.12;

Armenian

c'iw §17.1.14.4;
 holm §17.4.2;

Italic (Latin unspecified)

alma (Span.) §17.4.2;
 anima §17.4.2;
 caudex, cōdex §7.1.2. n8;

cūdō §7.1.2 n8;
 exhalare §16.1.4;
 inhalare §16.1.4;
 mōlō §7.2.2;
 obscūrus §17.1.14.4;
 PACARI (Old Lat.) §16.1.7 n75;
 pacer (Umbr.) §16.1.7;
 pacre (Marr.) §16.1.7;
 pacris (Palign.) §16.1.7;
 pāscō §13.2.3;
 pellis §17.1.11;
 silere §17.1.14.3;
 silva §17.1.14.3;
 vexāre §7.2.8 and n24;

Celtic

cloīd (OIrish) §7.1.4.2;
 cúl (OIrish) §17.1.14.4;
 gaou (Bret.) §16.1.6;
 gau (ModW.) §16.1.6;
 gáu, gáo, gó (OIrish) §16.1.6;
 geu (MW.) §16.1.6;
 gú-forcell (OIrish) §16.1.6;
 naun (MCorn.) §17.2.3;
 newyn (ModW.) §17.2.3;
 nūne, naunae (OIrish) §7.2.5;
 §17.2.3;

Germanic

aih, aigum (Goth.) §12.5;
 ávalur (Icel.) §18.1.5;
 bjúgur (Icel.) §18.1.5;
 eftir, á eftir (Icel.) §17.1.5;
 endi (OÍcel.) §16.1.5;
 enni (OÍcel.) §16.1.5;
 fell (OÍcel.) §17.1.11;
 fraþi (Goth.) §18.1.23;
 fróðr (OÍcel.) §18.1.23;
 Geheimnis (Germ.) §18.1.17;
 gihei (OHG.) §19.6;
 grautr (OÍcel.) §17.1.8;
 gruzzi (OHG.) §17.1.8;
 haizam (Goth.) §19.6;
 hamr (OÍcel.) §7.2.9;
 heat (Engl.) §19.6;

hei (OHG.) §19.6;
 Heim (Germ.) §18.1.17;
 Heimat (Germ.) §18.1.17;
 heimlich (Germ.) §18.1.17;
 hemja (OÍcel.) §7.2.9;
 hemmen (Germ.) §7.2.9;
 Hitze (Germ.) §19.6;
 hléotan (OE.) §7.1.4.2;
 hliotan (OS.) §7.1.4.2;
 hljóta (OÍcel.) §7.1.4.2;
 hljótask (OÍcel.) §7.1.4.2;
 íbjúgur (Icel.) §18.1.5;
 inn (Icel.) §19.14;
 innundir (Icel.) §19.14;
 nár (OÍcel.) §17.2.3;
 naus (Goth.) §7.2.5; §17.2.3;
 schülen (MHG.) §17.1.14.4;
 sen, i sen (Swed.) §17.1.5;
 skáli (OÍcel.) §17.1.14.4;
 skjól (OÍcel.) §17.1.14.4;
 skuggi (OÍcel.) §17.1.14.4;
 skúr (OÍcel.) §17.1.14.4;
 ský (OÍcel.) §17.1.14.4;
 spannan (OHG.) §7.2.6;
 (sich) streichen (Germ.) §9.1.2;
 strjúka (OÍcel.) §9.1.2;
 svali (OÍcel.) §17.1.14.3 n92;
 svalki (OÍcel.) §17.1.14.3 n92;
 svalr (OÍcel.) §17.1.14.3 n92;
 tvennur, í tvennt, í tvennu lagi (Icel.)
 §19.18 and n105;
 twiccian (OE.) §7.2.8 n25;
 undir (Icel.) §19.14;
 (ga)wagian (Goth.) §7.2.8;
 wecgan (OE.) §7.2.8;
 wegan (OE.) §7.2.8;
 wegen (OHG.) §7.2.8;
 weggen (OHG.) §7.2.8;
 víðr (OÍcel.) §19.1;
 (ga)wigan* (Goth.) §7.2.8;
 wīt (OHG.) §19.1;

Baltic

āpskritas (Lith.) §18.1.5;
 gretà §16.1.1;

kļūt (Latv.) §7.1.4.2;
 kļūtas (Latv.) §7.1.4.2;
 kliūti (Lith.) §7.1.4.2;
 laukas (Lith.) §18.1.11;
 lauke (Lith.) §18.1.11;
 malti (Lith.) §7.2.2;
 nāve (Latv.) §7.2.5; §17.2.3;
 sūolas (Lith.) §17.1.12;
 sváidyti (Lith.) §16.2.3;
 sviēst (Latv.) §16.2.3;
 sviesti (Lith.) §16.2.3;
 šiáurė (Lith.) §17.1.14.4;
 šiaurys (Lith.) §17.1.14.4;

Slavic

dvigatisja (OCR.) §7.2.8;
 dvignoti (OCS.) §7.2.8;
 modrý (Czech) §17.1.3;
 naví (OCS.) §7.2.5;
 sěverŭ (OCS.) §17.1.14.4;
 skala §17.1.14.3;
 živati (OCR.) §9.2.2;

Hittite

mall(i)- §7.2.2;
 utnē §19.2 n102;

References

- Adams, D. Q.
 1978 "Ablaut and Umlaut in the Tocharian Vowel System", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 98, pp. 446-450.
 1988 *Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology*. American Oriental Series, Volume 71. New Haven.
 1989 "Marginalia to the Tocharian lexicon II", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3, pp. 5-19.
 1990 "Marginalia to the Tocharian Lexicon III", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 4, pp. 79-86.
 1990a "Some Reflexes of PIE Neuter *n*-Stems in Tocharian", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 4, pp. 65-78.
- Anreiter, P. P.
 1984 *Bemerkungen zu den Reflexen indogermanischer Dentale im Tocharischen*. Innsbruck.
- Arndt, W. W., P. W. Brosman, F. E. Coenen, & W. P. Friedrich, (eds.),
 1967 *Studies in Historical Linguistics in Honor of George Sherman Lane*. University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures. Number Fifty-Eight. Chapel Hill.
- Bernhard, F.
 1958 *Die Nominalkomposition im Tocharischen*. Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Georg August-Universität zu Göttingen. Göttingen.
- van Brock, N.
 1971 "Le traitement des nasales voyelles en tokharien", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 85, pp. 280-295.
- Broomhead, J. W.
 1962a *A Textual Edition of the British Hoernle, Stein, and Weber Kuchean Manuscripts. With Transliteration, Translation, Grammatical Commentary and Vocabulary*. A Dissertation submitted in Candidature for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Cambridge.
 1962b *British Hoernle, Stein, and Weber Textual Edition of Manuscripts*. Vol. II. Vocabulary. Cambridge.
- Couvreur, W.
 1947 *Hoofdaken van de Tochaarse Klank- en Vormleer*. Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven. Philologische Studien. Teksten en Verhandelingen — II. Reeks: Deel 4. Leuven.
 1950 "B-Tocharische Etymologien", *Archiv Orientalní* 18, 1-2, [*Symbolae ad studia orientis pertinentes Frederico Hrozný dedicatae*,] pp. 126-130.
 1954 Review: "W. Krause's Westtocharische Grammatik. Bd. I: Das

- Verbum. Heidelberg 1952", *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 208. Jahrgang, Nr. 1/2, [Göttingen,] pp. 79-92.
- 1954a "Kutschische Vinaya- und Prätimokṣa-Fragmente aus der Sammlung Hoernle", in *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller*. Zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern. Leipzig, pp. 43-52.
- 1955-1956 "Bemerkungen zu Pavel Pouchas Thesaurus linguae tocharicae dialecti A", *La Nouvelle Clío* VII - VIII, 1-3, pp. 67-98.
- Cowgill, W.
- 1967 "Ablaut, Accent, and Umlaut in the Tocharian Subjunctive", in: W. W. Arndt et al. (eds.), *Studies in Historical Linguistics in Honor of George Sherman Lane*. Chapel Hill, pp. 171-181.
- 1979 "Anatolian *hi*-Conjugation and Indo-European Perfect: Instalment II", in: E. Neu & W. Meid (eds.), *Hethitisch und Indogermanisch. Vergleichende Studien zur historischen Grammatik und zur dialektgeographischen Stellung der indogermanischen Sprachgruppe Altkleinasiens*. Innsbruck, pp. 25-39.
- Duchesne-Guillemin, J.
- 1941 "Tocharica", *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 41, pp. 140-183.
- Edgerton, F.
- 1985 *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Volume II: *Dictionary*. Kyoto. [Originally published 1953]
- Filliozat, J.
- 1948 *Fragments de textes koutchéens de médecine et de magie. Texte, parallèles sanskrits et tibétains, traduction et glossaire*. Paris.
- Gippert, J.
- 1979 Review: "A. J. Van Windekens' Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Vol. I: La phonétique et le vocabulaire. Louvain 1976", *Acta Orientalia* 40, pp. 268-279.
- Grassmann, H.
- 19765 *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. 5., unveränderte Auflage. Wiesbaden.
- Hamp, E. P.
- 1973 "Formations indoeuropéennes à second élément *(-Ho)k"-", *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 68, pp. 77-92.
- Hermann, E.
- 1922 Review: E. Sieg & W. Siegling, *Tocharische Sprachreste*, I. Band. Die Texte: A. Transkription. B. Tafeln. Berlin & Leipzig 1921. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 50, pp. 296-314.
- Hilmarsson, J.
- 1982/83 "Die Lautfolge *sp* in den tocharischen Sprachen", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96, pp. 159-166.
- 1984 "Notes on East Tocharian *ort* 'friend(?)', etc., and the question of

- u-umlaut of Tocharian *ā*", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 43, pp. 107-121.
- 1984a "Reconstruction of a Tocharian paradigm: the numeral 'one'", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 97, pp. 135-147.
- 1985 "Tocharian B *krorīyai* (obl. sg.), A *kror* 'crescent, horn of the moon' ~ Hitt. *karayar* 'horn' ~ Arm. *eļjiwr* 'horn' < I.-E. **ghrēyǵ*", *Die Sprache* 31, pp. 40-47.
- 1986 *Studies in Tocharian Phonology, Morphology and Etymology with Special Emphasis on the o-Vocalism*. Ph.D. Dissertation Leiden 1986. Reykjavík.
- 1986a "The etymology of Toch. A *kur-*, B *kur-* / *kwr-* 'to grow old, decrepit' and their derivatives A *oñkrac* (indecl.), B *oñkrocce* (obl. sg. m.) 'immortal, eternal'", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 47, pp. 87-98.
- 1986b "East Tocharian *klop* 'misfortune, suffering, pain'", in: Eivind Kahrs (ed.), *Kalyānamitrārāgaṇam*. Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson. Institutet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Series B: Skrifter LXX. Oxford, pp. 105-114. [= Hilmarsson 1986, pp. 112-124]
- 1987 "Stray notes on the interrogative pronominal stems in Tocharian", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 1, pp. 40-48.
- 1987[89] "Reflexes of I.-E. **suH₂pto-/ōn* 'sunny' in Germanic and Tocharian", *Die Sprache* 33, pp. 56-78.
- 1987[89]b "On the History and Distribution of Suffixal *-y-/iy-* in Tocharian", *Die Sprache* 33, pp. 79-93.
- 1988 "Tocharian B *yapoy*, A *ype* 'land'", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 2, pp. 31-51.
- 1989 *The Dual Forms of Nouns and Pronouns in Tocharian*. TIES Supplementary Series, Volume 1. Reykjavík.
- 1990 "East Tocharian *ksär* 'in the morning' from I.-E. **ǵhdhjestro-*", in: L. Isebaert (ed.), *Studia etymologica indoeuropaea memoriae A. J. Van Windekens (1915-1989) dedicata*. (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 41), Leuven. Forthcoming [1991].
- 1990[91] "The verb *säl-* in Tocharian", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 4, pp. 87-117.
- 1991 "The fate of *TTR* / *RTT* in Indo-European", in: J. A. Harðarson, G. Meiser (eds.), *Festschrift für Helmut Rix*. Freiburg. Forthcoming [1991 or 1992].
- 1991a "The Nasal Prefixes and the Privative in Tocharian", in B. Schlerath (Hrsg.), *Akten der Tagung 'Tocharisch' der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*. TIES Supplementary Series, Volume 4, Reykjavík. Forthcoming [1991 or 1992].
- 1991b "West Tocharian *cowai* 'theft' ~ Germanic **þjuba-* 'thief'", in: G.

- Alhaug, K. Kruken, H. Salvesen (eds.), *Heidersskrift til Nils Hallan*. Norway. Forthcoming [1991].
- 1991c "The elements *-ñi-* and *-ñifi-* in Tocharian present and subjunctive classes", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 5. Forthcoming.
- Isebaert, L.
- 1980 *De Indo-Iraanse bestanddelen in de Tocharische woorden-schat. Vraagstukken van fonische productinterferentie, met bijzondere aandacht voor de Indo-Iraanse diafonen a, ä*. Leuven.
- 1981[1983] "Notes de lexicologie tokharienne V", *Orbis* 30, pp. 261-264.
- 1987 "A propos de deux adverbes koutchéens (B *kästwer* et *oşle / oşşale*)", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 1, pp. 63-69.
- 1988 "Adnotamenta Irano-Tocharica", in P. Kosta (Hrsg., unter Mitarbeit von G. Lerch und P. Olivier), *Studia indogermanica et slavica*. Festgabe für Werner Thomas zum 65. Geburtstag. München. Pp. 137-140.
- Ivanov, V. V.
- 1988 "Balto-slavjano-toxarskie izoglossy", *Balto-slavjanskije issledovanija* 1986. Moskva, pp. 45-60.
- Jasanoff, J.
- 1978 *Stative and Middle in Indo-European*. Innsbruck.
- 1987 "Some irregular imperatives in Tocharian", in: C. Watkins (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*. Papers from the Fourth East Coast Indo-European Conference, Cornell University, June 6-9, 1985. Berlin & New York, pp. 92-112.
- Klingenschmitt, G.
- 1981 "Albanisch und Indogermanisch", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 40, pp. 93-131.
- Krause, W.
- 1952 *Westtocharische Grammatik*. Band I. *Das Verbum*. Heidelberg.
- 1955 *Tocharisch*. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Vierter Band. Iranistik. Dritter Abschnitt. Leiden & Köln.
- Krause, W. & W. Thomas
- 1960 *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Band I. *Grammatik*. Heidelberg.
- Lane, G. S.
- 1938 "Problems of Tocharian Phonology", *Language* 14, pp. 20-38.
- 1967 see W. W. Arndt et al. 1967.
- Lévi, S.
- 1912 "Une légende du Karuṇā-Puṇḍarika en langue tokharienne", in: *Festschrift Vilhelm Thomsen*. Leipzig.
- 1913a "Le 'tokharien B', langue de Koutcha", *Journal asiatique* 2, pp. 311-380.
- 1933 *Fragments de textes koutchéens. Udānavarga, Udānastotra, Udānālaṃkāra et Karmavibhaṅga*. Publiés et traduits avec un vocabulaire et une introduction sur le 'tokharien'. Paris.

- Lévi, S. & A. Meillet
 1913 "Remarques sur les formes grammaticales de quelques textes en tokharien B", *Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 18, pp. 1-33.
 1933 *Fragments de textes koutchéens. Udānavarga, Udānastotra, Udānālamkāra et Karmavibhaṅga*. Publiés et traduits avec un vocabulaire et une introduction sur le 'tokharien'. Paris.
- Lubotsky, A.
 1988 "Tocharian A *ṣurm*, B *ṣarm* 'cause' and A *ṣul*, B *ṣale* 'mountain'", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 2, pp. 89-95.
- Lühr, R.
 1988 *Expressivität und Lautwandel*. Heidelberg.
- Marggraf, W.-J.
 1970 *Untersuchungen zum Akzent in Tocharisch B*. Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel. Kiel.
- Meillet, A. see Lévi & Meillet.
- Melchert, H. C.
 1977 "Tocharian verb stems in -tk-", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 91, pp. 93-130.
- Normier, R.
 1980 "Tocharisch *ñkät* / *ñakte* 'Gott'", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 94, pp. 251-281.
- Pedersen, H.
 1941 *Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichung*. Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser. XXVIII,1. København.
 1944 *Zur tocharischen Sprachgeschichte*. Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser. XXX,2. København.
- Penney, J. H. W.
 1989 "Preverbs and Postpositions in Tocharian", *Transactions of the Philological Society*. Vol. 87, pp. 54-74.
- Peters, M.
 1980 *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 377. Band. Wien.
- Pinault, G.-J.
 1987 "Épigraphie koutchéenne. I. Laissez-passer de caravanes. II. Graffites et inscriptions", in: Chao Huashan, Simone Gaulier, Monique Maillard & Georges Pinault, *Sites divers de la région de Koutcha. Épigraphie koutchéenne*. Mission Paul Pelliot. Documents archéologiques, VIII. Paris, pp. 59-204 [with XCVI plates].

- 1988 "Revision des fragments en tokharien B de la légende de Mahāprabhāsa", in: P. Kosta (Hrsg.; unter Mitarbeit von G. Lerch und P. Olivier), *Studia indogermanica et slavica*. Festgabe für Werner Thomas zum 65. Geburtstag. München, pp. 175-210.
- 1989 "Une version koutchéenne de l'Aggañña-sutta", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3, pp. 149-220.
- 1989a "Introduction au tokharien", *Lalies* [Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature] 7 (Aussois, 27 août - 1^{er} septembre 1985), pp. 3-224.
- 1990 "Notes sur les manuscrits de *Maitreyasamiti*", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 4, pp. 119-202.
- 1991 "Formes verbales nouvelles dans des manuscrits inédits du fonds Pelliot Koutchéen", in B. Schlerath (Hrsg.), *Akten der Tagung 'Tocharisch' der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*. TIES Supplementary Series, Volume 3, Reykjavík. Forthcoming.
- Pisani, V.
1942-43 "Glottica Parerga. 5. Etimologie tocariche", *Reale Istituto Lombardo de Scienze e Lettere. Rendiconti. Classe di Lettere* 76,2. Milano, pp. 241-254.
- Pokorny, J.
1959 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern & München.
- Poucha, P.
1955 *Thesaurus linguae tocharicae dialecti A*. Institutiones linguae tocharicae. Pars I. Monografie Archivu Orientalného. Edited by J. Rypka. Vol. XV. Praha.
- Rasmussen, J. E.
1988 "Tocharian B *oñkolmo*, A *oñkalām* 'elephant': an etymological suggestion", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 2, pp. 166-183.
- 1989 *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck.
- Ringe, D. A.
1989 "Tocharian B *ausu*, *aušu*, *aultsu*", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3, pp. 35-50.
- 1989a "The imperative prefix /pa/ in the Tocharian B dialects", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3, pp. 51-63.
- Schmidt, K. T.
1969 *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen. Göttingen.
- 1980 "Zu Stand und Aufgaben der etymologischen Forschung auf dem Gebiete des Tocharischen", in: Manfred Mayrhofer, Martin Peters & Oskar E. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie*. Akten der VI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen

- Gesellschaft. Wien, 24. - 29. September 1978. Wiesbaden, pp. 394-411.
- 1984 "Bericht über das Projekt eines sanskrit-tocharischen Wörterbuchs", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 97, pp. 148-153.
- 1985 "Beiträge zur Kenntnis der tocharischen Verbmorphologie", in Bernfried Schlerath (ed.) [unter Mitarbeit von Veronica Rittner], *Grammatische Kategorien. Funktion und Geschichte. Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, Berlin, 20.-25. Februar 1983. Wiesbaden, pp. 424-434.
- 1986 "Bemerkungen zur westtocharischen Umgangssprache", in Annemarie Etter (ed.), *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*. Berlin & New York, pp. 635-649.
- 1986a *Fragmente eines buddhistischen Ordinationsrituals in westtocharischer Sprache*. Aus der Schule der Sarvāstivādins. Text, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen und Indizes. Manuskript einer Habilitationsschrift.
- Sieg, E.
1937 "Und dennoch Tocharisch", *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Phil.-hist. Klasse*. Berlin, pp. 130-139.
- 1938 "Die Kutschischen Karmavibhaṅga-Texte der Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 65, pp. 1-54.
- 1950 "Geschäftliche Aufzeichnungen in Tocharisch B aus der Berliner Sammlung", *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia*. Berlin, pp. 208-223.
- 1952 *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II*. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Werner Thomas. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. Jahrgang 1951 Nr. 1. Berlin.
- Sieg, E. & W. Siegling
1931 "Udānavarga-Übersetzungen in 'Kutschischer Sprache' aus den Sammlungen des India Office in London", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 6, pp. 483-499.
- 1949 *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Heft 1. Die Udānālāṅkara-Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Glossar*. Göttingen.
- 1953 *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Heft 2. Fragmente Nr. 71-633*. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Werner Thomas. Göttingen.
- Sieg, E. & W. Siegling & W. Schulze
1931 *Tocharische Grammatik*. Göttingen.
- Slawski, F. (ed.)
1984 *Słownik prasłowiański*. Tom V. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk & Łódź.

- Smith, E.
1911 *"Tocharisch". Die neuentdeckte indogermanische Sprache Mittelasiens.* Christiania.
- Sturtevant, E.
1940 "The Greek κ -Perfect and Indo-European $-k(o)-$ ", *Language* 16, pp. 273-284
- Thomas, W.
1957 *Der Gebrauch der Vergangenheitstempora im Tocharischen.* Wiesbaden.
1971 *Bilinguale Udānavarga-Texte der Sammlung Hoernle.* Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. Jahrgang 1971. Nr. 7. Mainz & Wiesbaden
1974 "Zu einigen weiteren sanskrit-tocharischen Udānavarga-Fragmenten", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 88, pp. 77-105.
1976 "Ein weiteres tocharisches Udānavarga-Fragment", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 90, pp. 104-113.
1983 *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Teil I: Die Texte. Band 1. Fragmente Nr. 1-116 der Berliner Sammlung.* Herausgegeben von Emil Sieg[†] und Wilhelm Siegling[†], neuarbeitet und mit einem Kommentar nebst Register versehen von Werner Thomas. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge. Nr. 133. Göttingen.
1985 *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen (1960 - 1984).* Stuttgart.
1987 "Ein neues Pāṭayantika-Fragment in Toch. B", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 1, pp. 169-191.
- Thomas W. & W. Krause
1964 *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band II. Texte und Glossar.* Heidelberg.
- Van Windekens, A. J.
1944 *Morphologie comparée du tokharien.* Louvain.
1962 "Études de phonétique tokharienne II", *Orbis* 11, pp. 179-198.
1964 "Études de phonétique tokharienne VI", *Orbis* 13, pp. 223-233.
1968 "Études de phonétique tokharienne X: les préfixes privatif et intensif A ā-, B a-, etc.", *Orbis* 17, pp. 408-434.
1971 "Études de phonétique tokharienne XV", *Orbis* 20, pp. 108-117.
1974 "O nekotoryx neob''jasnennyx toxarskix slovax", *Étimologija* 1972. Moskva, pp. 141-142.
1976 *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Volume I. La phonétique et le vocabulaire.* Louvain.
1979 *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Volume II,1. La morphologie nominale.* Louvain.
1982 *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Volume II,2. La morphologie verbale.* Louvain.

Winter, W.

- 1952 "An Indo-European prefix *q- 'together with'", *Language* 28, pp. 186-191.
- 1962 "Nominal and Pronominal Dual in Tocharian", *Language* 38, pp. 111-134. [= W. Winter 1984, pp. 124-159]
- 1962a "Lexical Interchange between 'Tocharian' A and B", *Journal of the Americal Oriental Society* 81, pp. 271-280.
- 1972 "Zur Vertretung von *w nach Konsonant in Tocharisch B", *Orbis* 21, pp. 385-390.
- 1980 "Morphological signalling of selection properties: transitivity in Tocharian B and A verbs", in: Jacek Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Morphology. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs* 17. The Hague & Paris & New York, pp. 421-442.
- 1980a "Zum Beitrag der tocharischen Sprachen zu Problemen der lautlichen Rekonstruktion des Indogermanischen", in: M. Mayrhofer, M. Peters, O. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der VI Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, Wien, 24.-29. September 1978, pp. 542-564.
- 1980[81] Review: "A. J. Van Windekens' Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Vol. I, and Vol. II,1. Louvain 1976 and 1979", *Kratylos* 25, pp. 125-132.
- 1982 Review: "A. J. Van Windekens' Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes I: La phonétique et le vocabulaire. Louvain 1976", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 132, pp. 399-402.
- 1984 *Studia Tocharica*. Selected writings. Poznań.
- 1987 "Distributive numbers in Tocharian", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 1, pp. 238-244.
- 1988 "Cardinal points and other directions in Tocharian A and B", in: Mohammad Ali Jazayery & Werner Winter (eds.), *Languages and Cultures. Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé*. Berlin & New York & Amsterdam, pp. 775-791.